DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 193 SO 009 910

TITLE	Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Special Issue: Anthropological Resources and Teaching.
INSTITUTION	Council on Anthropology and Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 77
NOTE	41p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on Anthropology and Education, 1703 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 ($2.00)
JOURNAL CIT	Anthropology and Education Quarterly; v8 n1 Feb 1977
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Anthropology; *Cross Cultural Studies; Curriculum Planning; Educational History; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; Learning Activities; Resource Guides; Simulation; *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The theme of the journal of the Council on Anthropology and Education focuses on anthropological resources and teaching. Nine major articles comprise the special issue of the journal. The first article traces the development of the academic study and teaching of anthropology beginning in 1501. Although mentioned as early as the 1500s, anthropology did not emerge as a distinct discipline until the turn of the 19th century. The second article reports how a communications perspective and visual materials have been utilized to revitalize introductory area courses and discusses what might be done to incorporate a contextual understanding of mass media into classroom instruction. Using films, classmates, visitors, and museum artifact analysis, the third article presents ideas on four simulations which can increase undergraduate involvement in anthropology courses. The fourth article examines curriculum models for teaching anthropology. The Fifth article describes an elective physical anthropology course for the eighth grade. The sixth article shows how an anthropology learning center is used for grades three through six. The seventh article presents techniques to aid anthropologists who are asked to speak to elementary school classes. The eighth article discusses pre-collegiate anthropology materials. The final article, written by the editor, presents views on the future horizons of anthropology and education. (Author/JR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* material not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ANTHROPOLOGY & EDUCATION QUARTERLY

VOLUME VIII, NUMBER 1

FEBRUARY 1977

ED137193

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CAE
John H. Chilcott
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SPECIAL ISSUE: ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND TEACHING

ISSUE EDITORS

MARION J. RICE
University of Georgia

ALANSON VAN FLEET
Citizens Council for Ohio Schools

WALTER WATSON
Brock University, Ontario

1 / THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACADEMIC STUDY AND TEACHING OF ANTHROPOLOGY
Susan Dwyer-Shick and *Wilfred C. Bailey*

8 / HUMAN IMAGES: TEACHING THE COMMUNICATION OF ETHNOGRAPHY
Richard Chalfen

12 / FOUR SIMULATIONS TO INCREASE UNDERGRADUATE INVOLVEMENT IN ANTHROPOLOGY COURSES
Lynn Price Ager

14 / CURRICULUM MODELS FOR TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY
John H. Chilcott

19 / TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY AS SCIENCE AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL
Al Decanay, Jr.

23 / ANTHROPOLOGY LEARNING CENTERS: AN ENRICHMENT PROGRAM
Ann G. Lauderdale

26 / ANTHROPOLOGISTS AS ELEMENTARY TEACHERS: ORGANIZING A PRESENTATION
Eloise Barter

28 / REVIEW AND UPDATE: PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY MATERIALS
Thomas L. Dynneson

COUNCIL ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION

31 / Future Horizons in Anthropology and Education: The View from 1976
Robert B. Textor

35 / President's Report
Frederick Erickson

SO 009 910

ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION QUARTERLY

(formerly *Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, incorporating *Council on Anthropology and Education Newsletter*)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW EDITOR

The new editor of the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* is Charles Harrington of Columbia University. Manuscripts (see Information for Authors) and editorial correspondence should be sent to him directly.

Charles Harrington, Editor
Anthropology and Education Quarterly
Box 19
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Subscription to *AEQ* is by membership in the Council on Anthropology and Education (annual dues for individual members $7.50) or by library subscription ($10.00 per annum). Single copies, when available, $2.00 each.

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Manuscripts *(in triplicate)* should be addressed to the Editor of the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Box 19, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027. All papers appropriate for the AEQ are sent anonymously to readers. Only the title should appear on the manuscript itself; all identifying material (name and affiliation) should be restricted to a cover page which will be removed when the paper is sent for review. All identifying references and footnotes should appear on a separate removeable page.

* * *

An abstract of 50-75 words must accompany each article, followed by a list of not more than five words or phrases under which the article can be indexed.

* * *

In all other aspects as to style and reference, manuscripts must follow the style guide of the *American Anthropologist*, printed in the September 1976 issue (Vol. 78, No. 3, pp. 747-752).

THE COUNCIL ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION

The Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE) is a professional association of anthropologists and educational researchers concerned with the application of anthropology to research and development in education. Organized in 1968 within the American Anthropological Association, but separately incorporated, the Council regularly meets at the annual meetings of the Association.

Address all membership and subscription communications to:

Anthropology and Education Quarterly
Council on Anthropology and Education
1703 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Copyright © 1977 by the Council on Anthropology and Education. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reprinted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the publisher. Published quarterly—February, May, August, November—by the Council on Anthropology and Education, 1703 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20009. Printed in U.S.A. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC.

MAR 21 1977

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACADEMIC STUDY AND TEACHING OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Susan Dwyer-Shick / *Pennsylvania State University, Ogontz Campus*
Wilfrid C. Bailey / *University of Georgia*

The earliest reported use of "anthropology" in a way similar to its use today was a book with that title published in Leipzig in 1501. It was an anatomical work. In 1533 another book with the same title defined anthropology as a discourse on human nature. The first use of the word in English was apparently in 1655 in a book entitled *Anthropology abstracted; or, the idea of Humane nature reflected in briefe Philosophicall and anatomical collections* (Bendyshe 1865). In spite of these early beginnings, anthropology did not begin to emerge as a distinct discipline until the last half of the 19th century. A survey of literature related to the study and teaching of anthropology revealed that the debate on the nature of anthropology and its component subfields continued well into the early decades of this century. The formal teaching of anthropology was not established until the turn of the century (Dwyer-Shick 1976).

THE DEFINITION AND NATURE OF ANTHROPOLOGY

In retrospect, the discussion involving the choice of a name for the discipline of Anthropology appears lengthy and intense. In the first volume of the *Ethnological Journal* we find an article by Luke Burke, "Outlines of the Fundamental Doctrines of Ethnology," which defined ethnology as "a science which investigates the mental and physical differences of mankind, . . . and which seeks to deduce from these investigations, principles for human guidance in all the important relations of social existence" (Burke 1848). In 1863 Paul Broca defined ethnology in the first volume of the *Anthropological Review* as being "only a part of the science of man; the other part is general anthropology." The two formed but a single science for "all the human races from a great whole, and it is important to examine the group in its *ensemble* [emphasis in original], to determine its position in the series of beings . . . its common characteristics, whether in the anatomical and physiological or in the intellectual order" (Broca 1863).

In the same publication, James Hunt defined anthropology as "the science of the whole nature of man." Ethnology was "the history or science of nations or races." Since anthropology was to "deal with the origin and development of humanity," it therefore had to be concerned with "everything that will throw light on the physical or psychological history of man" (Hunt 1863). In 1864, Hunt included archaeology and ethnology as an "integral part of our science."

> Anthropology includes every science which bears directly on the science of man or mankind and includes anatomy, physiology, psychology, ethnography, ethnology, philology, archaeology and palaeontology as applied to man . . . . We only make use of these sciences so far as they will throw light on the past, the present, and the probable future of the human family [Hunt 1864].

Hunt proposed that the term ethnology be "expunged" and that the following be adopted:

> (1) *Historical anthropology*, for what has also been called human palaeontology or of late palaeoanthropology; (2) *Descriptive anthropology*, for what "French writers have hitherto called ethnography"; (3) *Comparative anthropology*, for what "recent English and American writers have called ethnology", covering "the science of human races" [Hunt 1865].

In the next year, Hunt concludes this series of yearly articles on nomenclature by proposing a fourth division to the three he recommended in 1865. He would add "*Archaic anthropology*, or the past history of man, from his physical remains and works" (Hunt 1866).

In 1868 Joseph Barnard Davis proposed an amalgamation of the Anthropological and Ethnological Societies of London under the term Anthropological (Davis 1868). Although this was eventually accomplished along the lines proposed by Davis, the debate over terminology and usage continued at least up to the beginning of the 20th century. In 1882 Robert Fletcher presented a historical review of the leading ethnological and anthropological societies of Europe and America in a series of lectures. He termed ethnology the science treating the races of man according to social attributes, while anthropology takes human anatomical structure as the basis of comparison (Fletcher 1882). Edward Burnett Tylor in the 1894 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* used only the title of "Anthropology" to describe essentially the same materials and approach. R. Munro in his Presidential Address of 1893 before the British Association for the Advancement of Science said that because of the difficulty in framing a comprehensive and distinctive definition, anthropology had not yet earned its ranking as an independent science (Munro 1893). Writing just one year later in the American publication, *The Chautauquan*, Frederick Starr bemoaned the situation similarly for he saw

"in no other science probably is there so much indefiniteness in terminology as in anthropology. The word anthropology itself is used with several different meanings and the names of the subordinate sciences usually considered as comprised within it are variously applied." Starr considered anthropology as a science of the latter half of the 19th century, fighting its way to recognition. He also emphasized that anthropology was "claiming its rank among the sciences" through the recognition that "man's proper study is mankind" (Starr 1894).

A prominent problem in this debate, recognized by several writers over a period of time, was the "sharing" with several other fields of scientific study overlapping domain (Tylor 1894). John J. Wild characterized anthropological investigations as coinciding "to a large extent with the domains hitherto appropriated by the historian, the philologist, the antiquarian and the ethnologist." Perhaps seeking to forestall charges of infringement by these disciplines, Wild also added that anthropology was "not intended to displace these predecessors of and cooperators in anthropological research," but "on the contrary, the principal object of anthropological science is to concentrate, as it were, in a focus all the information collected up to this date by their separate labours" (Wild 1889). Wild's discussion perhaps reminds a reader of the similar claim made so eloquently by Clyde Kluckhohn in *Mirror for Man* (1949). And indeed, this claim is made continually in the introductions to many introductory anthropology textbooks published today.

In addition to the debate over the appropriate terminology for this new science, there was the parallel attempt at arriving at a classification of the results of this scientific investigation. Perhaps the most well known of these discussions centered upon the classification scheme submitted by Francis Galton in 1898 to the International Catalogue Committee of the Royal Society of London and published in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. The main divisions proposed included: general works; museums and collections; archaeology; anthropometry; races; industrial occupations and appliances; arts of pleasure; communication of ideas; superstition, religion, customs; administration and economics; sociology, chiefly of primitive races (Galton 1898).

In that same year Brinton severely criticized Galton's proposal, now termed Schedule Q, Anthropology, for what were considered to be serious omissions in ethnography as outlined in the Schedule. There was no mention of the study of folklore at all, an omission which Brinton labeled as "curious . . . in these days" (Brinton 1898). Franz Boas criticized the classification for not being systematic, and he proposed instead "for descriptive material a less number of sub-divisions combined with geographical sub-divisions." For ethnological discussions Boas suggested the discarding of geographical subdivisions and their replacement by "an exhaustive ethnological sub-division" (1899).

In 1899 W. J. McGee acknowledged that special difficulties were no doubt encountered in dealing with the subject of anthropology "for the reason that this youngest of the sciences is not yet organized in a manner acceptable to the entire body of students," and therefore the "scheme proposed is not classific in any proper sense, but rather a nearly random assortment of catchwords." Nevertheless, McGee concluded that "the final test of the value of any catalogue is found in the practical operation of the law of supply and demand, with respect to both raw material and finished product." With this in mind, McGee believed that "no working anthropologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology would seriously undertake the cataloguing of anthropological literature, or any branch thereof, in accordance with the extravagantly complex scheme of the Royal Society Committee, and that the library of the Bureau could not be arranged under it" (McGee 1899). It may well be that such immediate and serious criticisms contributed to the decision against adopting this classification system. What these discussants did agree upon, however, was the pressing need for a classification system which would be widely agreed to and set forth a prevailing terminology.

TEACHING OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Early training in anthropology was in connection with museums. Paul Broca was offering regular courses in Paris museums by 1870. Edward B. Tylor was keeper of the Oxford University Museum and became lecturer in 1883. He was made England's first professor of anthropology in 1898 (MacCurdy 1899). The first Ph.D. with anthropology as the major subject was awarded by the University of Munich to G. Buschan in 1888 (Tracy 1889). In this same year Franz Boas went to Clark University and became the first professor of Anthropology in the United States. Alexander F. Chamberlain earned the first American Ph.D. there in 1892 after Boas had already resigned his position.

At the basis of the search for terminology and classification was the concern for the presentation of the results of anthropological research. Brinton clearly linked such concerns in his article "The Nomenclature and Teaching of Anthropology" which appeared in the *American Anthropologist* (Old Series) with comments by John Wesley Powell (Brinton 1892b). In the same year Brinton arranged for the private printing and circulation of his "Anthropology: As a Science and as a Branch of University Education." Here Brinton made his pitch for anthropology as part of university curricula to an audience of "officers and patrons of our universities and post-graduate departments" in the United States. Brinton firmly believed that "the rightful claims of this science [would be] recognized only when it is organized as a department by itself with a competent core of professors and curators, with well-appointed laboratories and museums, and with fellowships for deserving students." The literature of that time and of following decades would clearly indicate that curators and professors, funds for

university laboratories and museum exhibits, were sometimes mutually exclusive. The appeal to "patrons" was an important source of early support for several departments of anthropological instruction here duly noted by Brinton. The final part of this circulation outlined the planned course of instruction on an introductory level including (1) synopsis of a lecture course, (2) laboratory work, (3) library work, (4) fieldwork, and (5) text books (Brinton 1892a).

In his presentation before the New York meeting of the American Naturalists and Affiliated Societies, December 1898, Boas characterized anthropology as "one of the subjects that have been added to the university curriculum quite recently." For this reason Boas decided to devote his remarks to "a consideration of the field that anthropological instruction is intended to cover and of its relations to allied sciences rather than to a discussion of methods of instruction." In the remainder of this talk, later published as "Advances in Methods of Teaching" in *Science*, Boas lays out a now familiar argument for the introduction of anthropological instruction. That is, anthropology is of extreme "educational value, particularly in so far as it broadens the historical views of the student, because it extends his view over cultures and civilizations that have grown up uninfluenced by our own. The advances made by our own race will appear to him in a truer light when he is able to compare them with the work done by other peoples and races; and if he understands how much our own civilization owes to the achievements of people who appear to be at present on a low level of culture. The methodological value of the teaching of anthropology lies in the fact that it shows the possibility of applying inductive methods to the study of social phenomena" (Boas 1899a).

In addition to presenting a particular view point as to the appropriate instructional structure for anthropology, several authors early on were interested in documenting (i.e., counting) the inroads made in academic curricula and faculty on the part of anthropology. As early as 1892 Frederick Starr, utilizing a biographical approach, presented not "a history of anthropology in America," but rather a "survey of activities in the teaching of anthropology; the areas of research; and the publications within the emerging field" (Starr 1892). At least by 1894 there was already a concern with a more or less systematic surveying of the academic institutions of the United States and Europe to determine the extent and level of the instruction of anthropology. Alexander F. Chamberlain published in 1894 his "Anthropology in Universities and Colleges" in an attempt to "exhibit in the tersest form possible the present state of anthropological study in the higher institutions of learning in Europe and America, and to indicate how great has been the interest shown in, and the attention devoted to, this subject in very recent years." He provided here a review of those academic institutions which offered course work in anthropology, exclusive of comparative philology, and included data on department affiliation, title, and instructor, when such information was available (Chamberlain 1894).

In that same year, George A. Dorsey published his survey article on the teaching of anthropology in American colleges in the short-lived publication *The Archaeologist*. Here he acknowledged credit to an earlier pamphlet "Graduate Courses" compiled by the Graduate Club of Harvard University for stimulating his idea and for providing in its Section 13 (Social Science, Anthropology and Ethnology) detailed information on all of the courses in these areas then offered by 19 of "our leading colleges." After eliminating all courses devoted to pure economics, retaining all those that may be said to fall within the field of Anthropology, using that word in its broadest usage, Dorsey concluded that anthropological studies of some sort were given in 16 colleges while well organized departments of anthropology were to be found in four. He concluded: "Taking into consideration the fact that only recently has this science been recognized as a part of a college education abroad and in America, especially the ground which has been gained is considerable and furnishes much that is encouraging to American students of Anthropology" (Dorsey 1894).

Two year later, Dorsey published "The History of the Study of Anthropology in Harvard University." In this 20-page article he traced the development of anthropology as a subject of instruction at Harvard from 1866; founding of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology; establishing the Department of American Ethnology and Archaeology in 1885 and its announcement in 1890 that it was ready to accept students for the awarding of degrees; and through 1895, courses offered, enrollment, publications, financial support and expansion plans (Dorsey 1896). Dorsey was the first recipient of the Ph.D. in anthropology from Harvard in 1894.

Writing on the occasion of the recognition of the Smithsonian Institution's first half-century, J. W. Fewkes credited the Smithsonian with the advancement of knowledge and its subsequent diffusion among the population through "a rich and well-arranged collection of anthropological material" and "a well-arranged museum . . . teaching many who are not reached by other methods" (Fewkes 1897).

Through personal correspondence, George G. MacCurdy was able to determine that at least 48 academic institutions in 13 countries offered some form of instruction in anthropology by 1899. The teaching force was placed by MacCurdy at 74 (17 in the United States), with professorships (in the strict sense of that term) numbering only one for this country, i.e., Franz Boas at Columbia University, New York City. The substance of MacCurdy's research was presented before the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in Columbus, Ohio, August 1899, and led to the appointment of a committee to "consider ways and means of furthering the instruction in anthropology in all the institutions of learning and to report back at the Christmas meeting of the Society."

Committee members included W. J. McGee (Washington, D.C.), F. Russell (Cambridge), and G. G. MacCurdy (New York). Added at the first meeting were F. Boas (New York) and W. H. Holmes (Washington, D.C.). Three years later, in 1902, MacCurdy again took stock of the academic instruction of anthropology, this time making use of a questionnaire as well as personal correspondence, although limiting the data to the United States. His research uncovered at least 31 universities which offered courses in anthropology in conjunction with other subjects. He also noted that the Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts, had by this date instituted a program and hired instructors. MacCurdy concluded on an optimistic note, "This seems to be the normal role of development and would of itself, in time, suffice to carry instruction in anthropology to every growing college and university in America" (MacCurdy 1902).

Perhaps Boas did not share the optimism of Starr or MacCurdy. More than likely he was reluctant to trust the growth of anthropological instruction to absentee leadership or leadership other than his own. In 1901, writing in response to an inquiry from Zelia Nuttal regarding the establishment of anthropology in California, Boas wrote:

> It is a matter of the greatest importance that the work in California should be taken up with the greatest energy. If the question were asked how greater funds could be expended advantageously, I would suggest that the following method would give the most satisfactory results: Establish for a period of five years four fellowships in ethnology and two fellowships in archaeology. Let these fellowships be made for the first few years in Columbia for ethnology and in Harvard for archaeology. As soon as one of these fellows is trained far enough to do independent work, let the fellowship be transferred to the University of California, and give the fellow an opportunity to do field-work in that State. . . . For the next five years, and not longer, give me the opportunity to direct operations, in order to establish them on a definite systematic basis, and I am certain that at the close of this time a strong department in the University of California could be formed entirely independently of any further cooperation on our part [Boas 1901].

In 1919 Boas and MacCurdy both published relatively short pieces in the *American Anthropologist* under similar titles which surveyed the state of the academic teaching of anthropology. Boas' article covered four areas of concern: (1) the science of anthropology; (2) the aim of non-professional anthropology instruction; (3) the professional study of anthropology; and (4) the requirements of a department of anthropology on the university and college level (Boas 1919). MacCurdy, on the other hand, presented a survey based on the results obtained from a total of 196 institutions where anthropology courses were given in connection with other academic departments, i.e., those not having anthropology in their title, and where the total academic faculty was thirty or more. He concluded that: (1) anthropology had gained a "foot-hold" at the "lesser" schools and at state supported colleges and universities and (2) anthropology courses being taught were found to be primarily offered in conjunction with those in the natural sciences already established within the curriculum (MacCurdy 1919).

The first extensive updating of the material assembled by MacCurdy on anthropology in American universities was undertaken, however, only in the late 1940s and completed in the spring of 1950. Erminie Wheeler Voegelin gathered data in a survey covering 600 universities and colleges in the United States and Canada under the auspices of the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association when she was serving as the Executive Secretary. This article includes a brief history of the establishment of the departments of anthropology and course offerings and a limited historical bibliography relating to the subject of teaching anthropology; however, the majority of the more than 40-page article is taken up by the statistical tabulation of courses and academic institutions (Voegelin 1950).

In 1953 the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research published a world-wide survey of anthropological institutions (Thomas and Pikelis 1953). An incomplete update appeared in *Current Anthropology* in 1964. The American Anthropological Association has published *Guide to Departments of Anthropology* annually since 1962-63. The 1976-77 edition lists 317 academic departments in 314 institutions and 60 departments in 56 museums. (Some schools and museums have more than one department.) A total of 4,285 individuals hold positions in the 377 departments located in the United States and Canada.

While there are several rather early examples of the concern which some anthropologists had regarding the kind and quality of the anthropological instruction available, on the whole this interest appears to come rather later on. No doubt the emphasis in the beginning was to introduce anthropological instruction. While there was obviously concern that those new professionals be well trained as anthropologists, there appeared to be little or no thought as to what kind of teachers they might make, even though, until very recently it was to teaching that the new Ph.D. turned. And yet it was not until 1957, at the 33rd annual meeting of the Central States Anthropological Society, that there was held a symposium devoted to the teaching of anthropology because, in the words of the organizer, Andrew H. Whiteford, "the majority of American anthropologists spend the majority of their time teaching. . . . [and] in many institutions, anthropologists have been deeply involved in the new developments in higher education and have contributed substantially to new courses and expanded curricula" (Whiteford 1960). Evidence of the growing concern for the quality of anthropological instruction comes from a number of diverse sources. These include brief notes in the *American Anthropologist* indicating examples of training and the 1952 series "The Training of the Professional Anthropologist." In 1965 Robert W. Ehrich began a regular column in the *Newsletter*. Especially noteworthy were the two volumes *Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology* and *The Teaching of Anthropology* edited by David G. Mandelbaum et al. which appeared in 1963 as part of the Memoir Series. The

founding of the Council on Anthropology and Education in 1971 and the beginning of its regular quarterly publication marks an important awareness of anthropology and education. In 1975 a special regular column began under the title of "The Teaching of Anthropology," edited by Dward Moore, Jr., and it has continued to meet with success. The brief contributions include proposed course syllabi, bibliography, new thoughts and directions in the teaching of specific courses, and in several instances an overt recognition of the relationship of the practice of anthropology and the communication of those results to anthropologist and non-anthropologist alike.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND LIBERAL EDUCATION

From the start of the discussion of the presentation of anthropological content for instructional purposes, there have appeared also a number of articles devoted to the presentation of the relation of such instruction to student, society, and finally the larger global community. One is almost tempted to label the argument under the title "worthiness." Brinton's address as retiring President of the AAAS, August 29, 1895, was intended to change the image of anthropology from what he characterized as "a dilettante occupation, suited to persons of elegant leisure and retired gentlemen, and without any very direct or visible practical application of concern with the daily affairs of life" (Brinton 1895).

In the 1907 note by W. Hough, "Anthropology in Education for the Foreign Service," the author clearly articulated a "visible practical application" for anthropology: "The basis of education for foreign service is anthropological. . . . Native arts, for instance, offer a point of approach for commercial exploitation in which anthropology can serve business," while also furnishing "knowledge of the mineral, animal, and vegetal wants of peoples, the processes and inventions involved in their preparation, the agencies through which they are distributed, and the methods by which they are utilized and enjoyed" (Hough 1907).

A similar tone was taken by a note appearing in a 1914 issue of *Nature* of a report of the Joint Committee of the Royal Anthropological Institute and Section H of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Here stress is laid upon the practical application of anthropological teaching in the university to alleviate the "wastage of millions of pounds sterling in trade" owing to the lack of anthropological training under official support and the lack of knowledge of "alien" peoples. The remedy was stated clearly: It was "in the interest of the Empire" to have anthropological training under governmental support in order to introduce a scientific system of anthropological instruction into the university system curriculum (Joint Committee of the Royal Anthropological Institute and Section H, British Association for the Advancement of Science 1914).

The literature is full of examples of the appropriateness of anthropology and anthropological instruction for the student at the university and college level, regardless of the planned or anticipated vocation. Boas included the following remarks within a lecture which he delivered in 1908 as part of the Series on Science, Philosophy and Art, Columbia University: "The definite facts that I could lay before you are few, and even the ground-work of the science appears hardly laid. Still I hope that the view of our ultimate aims may have engendered the feeling that we are striving for a goal which is bound to enlighten mankind, and which will be helpful in gaining a right attitude in the solution of the problems of life" (Boas 1908). Writing an article directed to a social work audience, A. Irving Hallowell attempted to call attention to some of the possibilities for rapport between the fields of social work and anthropology, believing that each had much to offer the other, and quotes Robert Lowie to support this position:

> As the engineer calls on the physicist for a knowledge of mechanical laws, so the social builder of the future who would seek to refashion the culture of his time and add to its cultural values, will seek guidance from ethnology, the science of culture, which in Tylor's judgement is "essentially a reformer's science" [Hallowell 1924].

Anthropology was seen also as part of a liberal education. Pearce (1927) expressed the common view that anthropological instruction provided the basis for a liberal education leading to better world understanding. Morris E. Opler wrote in a similar vein in the late 1930s when he urged the development of anthropological courses for those individuals who would eventually find themselves teaching within a nonanthropological context. Opler viewed such exposure to the development of cultures and peoples throughout the world as "the most potent antidote for extravagant claims on behalf of particular groups." The introductory sentence to his "Anthropology, Democracy, and the School" reflects the period: "We live in a day when lunatic and amoral usurpers of power are exploiting the ignorance of anthropology of great masses of people . . . no matter what the cost in slaughter, sacrifice, and misery may be" (Opler 1937). George D. Spindler presented a similar argument for the inclusion of anthropological instruction within "an educational system whereby a young person graduating is capable of thinking clearly and with insight in a world that must have clear-thinkers in order to survive." As the title of the article suggests, "Anthropology May Be the Answer" (Spindler 1946).

The inclusion of anthropology within a liberal education and teacher education concentrations were discussed in both the educational and professional anthropological literature. Beginning with the appropriateness of anthropology in the undergraduate curriculum, the argument was extended to apply to elementary and secondary levels and to teacher education programs.

PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY

One of the early calls for the introduction of anthropology in the secondary schools came from Jules Henry and

appeared in a 1939 issue of *Progressive Education*. Henry suggested that either of two methods of introduction might prove acceptable; (1) as a part of ongoing courses of study or (2) as a course of study itself. Similar to the position of Opler two years earlier, Henry believed that such material would help to combat what he termed pseudo-science of reaction and intolerance. Significantly, Henry also urges a strong emphasis upon having teachers of such courses trained in anthropology, *not* merely exposed to the subject somewhere along the line in their education (Henry 1939).

While the literature of the 1940s is primarily phrased in generalities, for the most part, as to the benefits of teaching anthropology, increasingly in the 1950s and 1960s there were published articles which described, sometimes in considerable detail, the workings of such a course. One example of this genre is R. I. Hayden's "Fifth-Graders Take a Crack at Anthropology" (1957). Unfortunately, this article is also somewhat typical of the kind of naive, and at times downright ethnocentric, attitude that a teacher (in this case the administrator) may very well perpetuate even though adopting the terminology of the subject. Also, and doubly unfortunate, is his reference in passing to the teacher selected as "guinea pig" for her interest in the subject of anthropology, although she had never actually taken a course.

This trickle of articles concerned with anthropology on the elementary and secondary levels became a flood in the 1960s and 1970s. The peak seems to have been 1968 when at least 27 were published. More descriptive articles are published, and not only those which spoke in glowing terms of an instructor's success or of the increased vistas of his or her students. For the first time there were projects begun to produce the kind of materials needed to teach at this level. Not watered-down anthropology, not pseudo-anthropological generalities, but seriously conceived and executed projects staffed by anthropologists and educators to develop curricula materials. The projects for producing teaching materials for pre-collegiate anthropology were at two levels of scale. First, there were large scale projects usually with federal support. These included the Anthropology Curriculum Project operating primarily at the elementary grades. A series of articles resulting from this project was described by Rice and Bailey in 1971.

The Anthropology Curriculum Study Project focused on the high school level. Materials from this project were summarized in *Social Education* (Charles 1972). Man A Course of Study (MACOS) was another project aimed at the lower grades (Joyce 1971). The second type of project produced experimental materials for a particular system or school. For example, a well-known anthropologist reported on the background, implementation, and subsequent evaluation of teaching an anthropology course to ninth-graders within a private school in suburban Chicago (Bohannan et al. 1969).

Sanders and Tanck made a critical appraisal of 26 national social studies projects. They included the major anthropology projects (1970). Malcolm Collier reviewed the status of teaching anthropology at the secondary and elementary school levels. She made two important statements. (1) "The problem facing curriculum developers is the need to concentrate on the objectives most crucial to the students' general education instead of including all that is relevant to the development of the professional anthropologist," and (2) "What actually happens to the teaching of anthropology by 1980 will depend on the quality of materials produced and the extent and quality of encouragement and opportunity which schools and communities give teachers to develop their intellectual and pedagogical skills" (1971).

Another analysis of pre-collegiate anthropology was introduced as follows:

> In spite of the fact that anthropology courses and units have been taught in a few elementary and secondary schools in the past, the discipline is not a widely accepted or taught subject at these levels. Some have argued that it may never become a full member of the social studies curriculum because of the problems that must be overcome in order for anthropology to gain wide acceptance. These problems include: teacher preparation in anthropology, local and state approval of anthropology courses, competition for "slots" in the curriculum from history and the other social sciences, parental and community resistance to anthropological explanations of man's development, and lack of sound and appropriate materials for classroom use . . . [Dynneson 1975:1].

The conclusion of Dynneson may be over pessimistic, however. While few courses may be offered under the taxonomy of anthropology, this nomenclature overlooks the substantial anthropological content in social studies courses utilizing cross cultural, area, or ethnographic approaches. Most anthropological content is now taught as part of ongoing courses of study, as Jules Henry suggested in 1939, rather than as separate, distinct anthropological courses.

SUMMARY

The above review of literature related to the development of the academic study and teaching of anthropology traces the struggle to identify the nature and components of the discipline. Anthropology was first taught in universities to train professionals. Later anthropology was promoted as a part of liberal education. The most recent development has extended the teaching of anthropology downward to the secondary and elementary grade levels.

NOTES

Acknowledgments. This article is based upon the 1976 annotated bibliography "The Study and Teaching of Anthropology" by one of the authors. See References Cited.

REFERENCES CITED

Bendyshe, Thomas
1865 The History of Anthropology. Anthropological Society of London, Memoirs 1:335-458.

Boas, Franz
1899a Advances in Methods of Teaching. Science 9(n.s.):93-96.
1899b Q. Anthropology. Science 10(n.s.):173-174.

1901, 1974 The Boas Plan for American Anthropology. (Letter dated May 16, 1901) in The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911. George W. Stocking, ed. Pp. 286-289. New York: Basic Books.
1908 Anthropology: A Lecture Delivered at Columbia University in the Series on Science, Philosophy and Art, December 18, 1907. New York: Columbia University Press.
1919 Report on the Academic Teaching of Anthropology. American Anthropologist 21:41-48.

Bohannan, Paul, et al.
1969 Experimental Ninth-Grade Anthropology Course. American Anthropologist 71:409-420.

Brinton, Daniel Garrison
1892a Anthropology: As a Science and as a Branch of University Education. Philadelphia: privately printed and circulated by Daniel Garrison Brinton.
1892b The Nomenclature and Teaching of Anthropology; Comment by John Wesley Powell. American Anthropologist 5(o.s.):263-271.
1895 The Aims of Anthropology. Science 2(n.s.):241-252.
1898 International Catalogue of Scientific Literature. Report of the Committee of the Royal Society of London, with the Schedules of Classification. Schedule Q, Anthropology. Science 8(n.s.):375-376.

Broca, Pierre Paul
1863 Review of the Proceedings of the Anthropological Society of Paris. Anthropological Review 1:274-310.

Burke, Luke
1848 Outlines of the Fundamental Doctrines of Ethnology; or The Science of the Human Races. Ethnological Journal 1:1-8, 129-141, 235-239.

Chamberlain, Alexander
1894 Anthropology in Universities and Colleges. The Pedagogical Seminary 3:48-60.

Charles, C. L.
1972 Anthropology Curriculum Study Project: Patterns in Human History. Social Education 36:724-726.

Collier, Malcolm
1971 Anthropology in the Schools. *In* The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 1. Lee C. Deighton, ed. Pp. 228-232. New York. Macmillan/Free Press.

Davis, Joseph Barnard
1868 Anthropology and Ethnology. Anthropological Review 6:394-399.

Dorsey, George A.
1894 The Study of Anthropology in American Colleges. The Archaeologist 2:368-373.
1896 The History of the Study of Anthropology in Harvard University. The Denison Quarterly 4(2):77-97.

Dwyer-Shick, Susan
1976 The Study and Teaching of Anthropology: An Annotated Bibliography. Anthropology Curriculum Project Publication No. 76-1. Athens: University of Georgia.

Fewkes, J. W.
1897 Anthropology. *In* The Smithsonian Institution 1846-1896: The History of Its First Half-Century. G. B. Godde, ed. Pp. 745-772. Washington, D.C.: Devine Printers.

Galton, Francis
1898 Syllabus of Anthropology Prepared for the International Catalogue Committee of the Royal Society of London. Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland 27:361-364.

Hallowell, A. Irving
1924 Anthropology and the Social Workers' Perspective. The Family 5:88-92.

Hayden, R. I.
1957 Fifth Graders Take a Crack at Anthropology. Instructor 66(May):85, 91, 97.

Henry, Jules
1939 Anthropology in the Secondary Schools. Progressive Education 16:509-510.

Hough, W.
1907 Anthropology in Education for the Foreign Service. American Anthropologist 9:768-770.

Hunt, James
1863 Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology. Anthropological Review 1:1-20.
1864 President's Address. Journal of the Anthropological Society of London 2(1):xxx-xcii.
1865 President's Address. Journal of the Anthropological Society of London 3(1):xxxv-cxii.
1866 Address Delivered at the Third Anniversary Meeting of the Anthropological Society of London. Journal of the Anthropological Society of London 4(1):lx-xxxi.

Joint Committee of the Royal Anthropological Institute and the British Association for the Advancement of Science
1914 The Teaching of Anthropology at Universities. Nature 92:725.

Joyce, William W.
1971 MACOS: A Report from the Inner-City. Social Education 35:305-308.

Kluckhohn, Clyde
1949 Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life. New York: McGraw-Hill.

MacCurdy, George Grant
1899 Extent of Instruction in Anthropology in Europe and the United States. Science 10(n.s.):910-917.
1902 The Teaching of Anthropology in the United States. Science 15:211-216.
1919 The Academic Teaching of Anthropology in Connection with Other Departments. American Anthropologist 21:49-60.

Mandelbaum, David G., G. W. Lasker, and E. M. Albert, eds.
1963a The Teaching of Anthropology. American Anthropological Association, Memoir 94.
1963b Resources for the Teaching of Anthropology. American Anthropological Association, Memoir 95.

McGee, W. J.
1899 Anthropology. Science 10(n.s.):48-50.

Munro, R.
1893 Anthropology Presidential Address. British Association for the Advancement of Science Report. Pp. 885-895.

Opler, Morris E.
1937 Anthropology, Democracy, and the School. California Journal of Elementary Education 7:206-209.

Pearce, J. E.
1927 Anthropology as an Element of a Rational Education. The Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly 8:253-271.

Rice, Marion J., and Wilfrid C. Bailey
1971 Final Report, The Development of a Sequential Curriculum in Anthropology, Grades 1-7. Athens: University of Georgia.

Sanders, N. M., and M. G. Tanck
1970 A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects. Social Education 34:383-448.

Spindler, George D.
1946 Anthropology May Be the Answer. Journal of Education 129:130-131.

Starr, Frederick
1892 Anthropological Work in America. Popular Science Monthly 41:289-307.
1894 What Is Anthropology? The Chautauquan 19:25-29.

Thomas, William L., Jr., and Anna M. Pikelis, eds.
1953 International Directory of Anthropological Institutions. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation.

Tracy, P.
1889 The First Doctor Philosophiae with Anthropology as Major Subject. American Anthropologist 2(o.s.):174.

Tylor, Edward Burnett
1894 Anthropology. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., 2:94-108.

Voegelin, Erminie W.
1950 Anthropology in American Universities. American Anthropologist 52:350-391.

Whiteford, A. H., ed.
1960 Teaching Anthropology. Logan Museum Publications in Anthropology, Bulletin No. 8.

Wild, John J.
1889 Outlines of Anthropology. Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science Report. Pp. 442-445.

HUMAN IMAGES: TEACHING THE COMMUNICATION OF ETHNOGRAPHY

Richard Chalfen / *Temple University*

The intent of this paper is twofold: to report how a communications perspective and visual materials have been utilized to revitalize introductory area courses—courses that have been losing enrollments; and to discuss what might be done to incorporate a contextual understanding of mass media into classroom instruction. The communication approach emphasizes the comparative use of visual and written ethnographic reports. Introductory courses that focus on a culture area should be substantive in ethnographic method and data as well as basic theory and data on processes of mass communication.

Visual materials—especially ethnographic films—are frequently used in introductory area courses as well as more general introductions to cultural anthropology. However, the approach to be explained and outlined in the following pages is not in the popular tradition of using ethnofilm to simply illustrate what some place, thing, event, or group of people look like. The contribution of utilizing a communications perspective is to stimulate attention to an anthropological understanding of communicating ethnography in professional and non-professional "teaching" contexts.

The communication of ethnography is illustrated by describing an introductory course "Human Images: A Communications Approach to Culture."[1] Human Images has been developed and offered every semester for the past four years as part of an undergraduate curriculum in cultural anthropology. Requiring no anthropology prerequisites, the course has been designed to attract first and second year students from a diversity of programs and majors within the University. Large enrollments have come from anthropology, communications, education, psychology, and sociology. The course is regularly over-enrolled and has stimulated some students to become anthropology majors.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Most introductory area courses include information on how the anthropologist works in the field. The use of key informants is discussed, as well as the ideals of participant observation, objectivity, the importance of "natural" context, and the quest for the native point of view. However, little is said of (1) how that information is organized and prepared for readers or viewers; (2) what assumptions are made about audiences for this information; or (3) what sorts of expectations are awaiting ethnographic reports from different segments of a reading/viewing public. For instance, how do the ethnographic reports and processes of communicating information gathered by the trained anthropologist differ from reports of similar subject matter produced by a journalist or photojournalist, an explorer, traveler or tourist, a novelist or a poet?

Anthropologists usually encourage their students to understand the cultural significance of behavioral acts, belief systems, and symbolic forms, as well as artifacts in the context of the society that make and use them. Why, then, should we not also encourage students to gain a critical competence for understanding and evaluating different types of ethnographic information that have been produced and used in a variety of contexts?

HUMAN IMAGES: A SURVEY OF ETHNOGRAPHIC REPORTS

The course offers students several opportunities to explore some of these problems. Human Images is as much about mass communication and media awareness as it is about Eskimo ethnography.

The ethnographic focus of the course offered at Temple is Eskimo society and culture. The Eskimo are well suited to this communication approach since they have been the subject of so many different forms of reporting. Accounts range from Knud Rasmussen's early folkloristic reports from the Thule Expeditions to the recent feature film production of James Houston's novel *The White Dawn*. Some other groups could serve as the ethnographic focus, such as the Navaho (Worth and Adair 1972).

Early sessions of the course are devoted to describing ethnographic fieldwork and visual anthropology within the context of the four subdisciplines of anthropology. A theory of culture is discussed that emphasizes (1) culture as communication (Hall 1959), (2) communication as codified behavior, and (3) culture as communicative knowledge. The epistemological basis for what it means to know another culture is reviewed, along with some inherent problems when relying too heavily on a culture-at-a-distance approach (Mead and Metraux 1952). Specific attention is paid to the problem of creating ethnocentric judgements when examining communicative products without knowledge of the cultural context or process surrounding the production and reception of the symbolic form.

The notion of a report is discussed as the product of

symbolic manipulation (Worth 1976) and as the creation of a symbolic environment (Gerbner 1972). In this sense, all reports are symbolic constructs and metaphoric. It is emphasized that a verbal or visual report cannot contain everything, and that each kind of report relies on readers'/viewers' ability to make appropriate inferences and appropriate assumptions about missing information. One purpose of Human Images is to better understand how to gain an ability to make appropriate inferences and assumptions and how these interpretations are structured.

The ethnographic report offers several problems. For either written or visual reports, the problematic concept of observational objectivity is central, which, in turn, must include discussion of the debate between phenomenal absolutism and culturally structured perception (Segall, Campbell, and Herskovits 1966). Learning to see and report is described as a product of culture. The anthropological perspective is described as a further refinement of observation and as a discipline-structured perspective that stresses the ideals (and often naivetés) of gaining the objective view and later the native's subjective view. The variability of reports becomes further complex when the idea of media-structured images is raised. The medium does indeed have a lot to do with structuring interpretations of the message, but the two must not be thought of as synonymous.

A deliberate attempt has been made to include readings and visual materials that offer complimentary ethnographic information. Students are urged to look for conflicting accounts. It is stressed that different media and different contexts are better suited for different informational tasks.

After discussing these ideas regarding the communication of ethnography, we begin to survey the variety of symbolic environments that have been created to describe Eskimo society. The formalities of the ethnographic report are introduced first as students read Asen Balikci's *Netsilik Eskimo* (1970). Simultaneously, students see a series of films by the same title as the visual ethnographic counterpart of the text (Honigmann 1970; Ackerman 1966). Balikci and Quentin Brown (1966) have attempted to reconstruct Eskimo life circa 1919, a time line before major changes occurred in terms of material culture, hunting technology and religion (Balikci 1973). The importance of relationships between the annual migration cycle, ecological adaptation and changes in social organization are adequately shown in four hours of the total nine hour series of films. One example of the complimentary nature of verbal and visual materials is that social organization is not very well seen in film form. The text serves this instructional task much better.

In four successive weeks, while the Balikci materials are presented in written and visual forms, lecture materials focus on Eskimo prehistory, social structure and the area of culture and personality (Briggs 1970).

In the following weeks, alternative visual reports of Eskimo are viewed. A natural starting point is Robert Flaherty's classic documentary *Nanook of the North* (1922). Since *Nanook* has been shown frequently on television and been used regularly in primary and secondary schools, this film is probably more responsible for the development of an Eskimo stereotype (called the "happy-go-lucky Eskimo" in the film) than any other single source. Flaherty's style of filmmaking and *Nanook* are mentioned in nearly every text on documentary or non-fiction film and is often incorrectly cited as the first ethnographic film (de Brigard 1975). Sources that describe Flaherty at work, his interaction with Port Harrison Eskimo, and his attempts to obtain commercial distribution provide students with excellent contextual information (Calder-Marshall 1963; Griffith 1953).

In comparing Balikci's and Flaherty's efforts, students are asked to realize that Nanook was being made during the period of time that is reconstructed in the Balikci films. However, when the communication contexts in which these visual ethnographic reports were produced and used are examined, differences far outnumber similarities. Comparison of these two ethnographic reports *as visual communication* clearly illustrates differences in filmmaking procedures, intentions, dramatic patterns, affect levels, anticipated audiences, and rewards. The central point here, and of the entire course, is that different patterns of communication will produce different interpretations of ethnographic information.

During the following week an unusual film *Wedding of Palo* (1937), directed by Knud Rasmussen, is presented. *Palo* serves as an important illustration of how a Western narrative structure can be imposed on a description of Eskimo culture (Kiefer 1974). An important problem in all ethnographic reporting is to discover what perceptual framework has organized the presentation. While Balikci attempted to have the events of the annual migration cycle structure the sequences, Flaherty sought to impose a dramatic storyline structured by conflicts of man versus nature. The tendency to include a Western dramatic pattern and narrative structure is further obvious in *Palo* and reaches an extreme in the next film, *The Savage Innocents*. *Palo* was made as a feature film for commercial distribution, and the use of Western film conventions and expectations is evident.

The following two weeks focus on literature that has been recognized as "anthropological fiction" (O'Brien 1973). Eskimo society has served as the setting for several novels and works of children's literature. Students are assigned to read James Houston's *The White Dawn* (1971; Graburn 1972), Hans Ruesch's *Top of the World* (1951) and, optionally, Ruesch's sequel *Back to the Top of the World* (1973).

The visual counterpart of Ruesch s first novel is a feature length cinemascope film entitled *The Savage Innocents* (1959). Directed by Nicholas Ray and starring Anthony Quinn, *Savage Innocents* provides students with many excellent examples of Hollywood's conception of Eskimo society by exaggerating stereotypic characteristics of childlike innocence and the primitive fun-loving native

(Chalfen 1973). It is significant to notice that *Savage Innocents* is the only film about Eskimos without any Eskimos in it.[2]

By this point in the course, students have become confidently critical of what is being shown. They will recognize the Westernization of just about everything, from material culture to dramatic storyline. It has become clear that these novels and feature films, produced for popular consumption, emphasize bizarre variations of our culture, such as infanticide, wife exchange, variant sexual practices, unfamiliar dietary habits and the like. Rather than introducing any significant new and valid ethnographic information to mass audiences, popular films like *The Savage Innocents* may only reify comfortable stereotypes and, in turn, say more about the society and culture that produced the film than about the society being shown.

The notion of fabricating a symbolic environment is easily illustrated in this section of the course. Students recognize the filmmakers' attempt to add a documentary flavor to *The Savage Innocents* by the heavy voice-over narration. Having already read and seen several alternative versions of Eskimo, students now enthusiastically discover the symbolic manipulations that are necessarily involved in any type of visual or verbal report.

In this first part of the course, students have been exposed to written accounts and visual presentations that have been produced by non-Eskimos. Control of the image making process has been left to outsiders. Eskimos have appeared as the "on-camera" subject matter rather than as authors or producers of the reports. Thus the second part of the course is directed to native expressive and artistic modes of verbal and visual communication.

Eskimo artistic products are first examined in the form of their sculpture (Swinton 1965) and their more recent printmaking (Houston 1967). Native concepts of art are discussed (Carpenter 1966, 1971) in conjunction with the "arts of acculturation" (Graburn 1967). A film about an Eskimo printmaker entitled *Kenojuak* (1964) is screened at this time. Students are also asked to examine Eskimo poetry (Radin 1955), music (Bolten 1954), and dance (Tomczak 1972) as other modes of communication.

The last section of the course is devoted to culture change. Students become very eager to learn about contemporary conditions. Norman Chance's book *The Eskimo of North Alaska* (1966) is read in conjunction with seeing the most recent film in the Netsilik series entitled *The Netsilik Eskimo Yesterday-Today* (1970). Here, the same family shown in the 1919 reconstruction footage is seen living in government housing, driving snowmobiles, smoking cigarettes, going to church and school, and the like.

Following the theme of native generated imagery, the course ends with the screening of *People of Tununak* (1974) and *Animation from Cape Dorset* (1975). In the first film, Eskimos from the Alaskan village of Tununak chose activities that *they* wanted preserved on film (Collier 1974). Students are very fond of seeing the animation film twice. The important issue underlying this section of Human Images is that Eskimos have gained some control of the production and manipulation of imagery that will be seen and used by people outside of their society.

CONCLUSIONS

There are several important consequences of teaching anthropology in the suggested format. It should first be acknowledged that students are experienced in media viewing. However, this is not to be confused with knowledge of media communication. The course Human Images stresses media awareness in the study of another culture by critically reviewing a number of statements or reports about one part of the world. The reports are understood as organized collections of symbolic forms. In this sense, they are interpretations rather than copies of what was seen. Emphasis is placed on treating these reports as communicative statements about Eskimo *and* about how different kinds of reporters have looked at Eskimo. We attempt to understand how appropriate interpretations are made from what we know about the context—namely, the type of production, anticipated use, purposes, rewards, and the like. When information on media technologies, production personnel, and anticipated functions and uses is included, students gain a critical appreciation of how diversified forms of ethnographic data have been produced for use in different contexts. Acknowledging that the communication context frequently determines what ethnographic information will be presented, it logically follows that problems surrounding the communication of ethnography should be discussed in conjunction with the presentation of the data.

While stressing the determined accuracy of the trained anthropologist's observations and recorded accounts, much is still to be learned from the diversity and popularity of other reports. Instructors should be encouraged to learn more about the communication of ethnographic data and the rich variety of resources that await creative integrations of written and visual forms.

NOTES

[1] A 14 page course syllabus is available by writing to the author at the Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. The syllabus includes the assignment of a "journal" to be written throughout the semester and class projects for extra credit. The course, as originally developed by my colleague Jay Ruby, was called "Images of Man—A Cinematic Approach to Culture." My reformulation of the course has broadened the notions of "image" and "communication" and sought to incorporate additional alternative forms of the "ethnographic" report.

[2] In contrast, the film version of James Houston's *White Dawn*, directed by Philip Kaufman, was filmed on location and used a large cast of Eskimo actors (see Judith McNally's 1974 article "The White Dawn" in *Filmmakers Newsletter* 7[11]:28-33). However, at this writing, the film is not available for distribution in 16mm.

REFERENCES CITED

Ackerman, Robert
1966 *Film Review of* Netsilik Eskimo Fishing at the Stone Weir. American Anthropologist 68:1327-1328.

Balikci, Asen
1970 The Netsilik Eskimo. New York: Natural History Press.
1973 Reconstructing Cultures on Film. Paper presented at the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago.

Balikci, Asen, and Quentin Brown
1966 Ethnographic Filming and the Netsilik Eskimos. Educational Services Inc. Quarterly Report, Newton, Massachusetts.

Bolton, Laura
1954 The Eskimo of Hudson Bay and Alaska. Folkways Records, Harold Courlander, ed. No. FE 4444.

Briggs, Jean L.
1970 Kapluna Daughter. *In* Women in the Field. Peggy Golde, ed. Pp. 19-44. Chicago: Aldine.

Calder-Marshall, Arthur
1963 The Innocent Eye -The Life of Robert J. Flaherty. Baltimore: Penguin.

Carpenter, Edmund
1971 The Eskimo Artist. *In* Anthropology and Art. Charlotte Otten, ed. Pp. 163-171. New York: Natural History Press.
1966 Image Making in Arctic Art. *In* Sign Image Symbol. Gyorgy Kepes, ed. Pp. 206-225. New York: Braziller.

Chalfen, Richard
1973 Collected Reviews of "The Savage Innocents." Manuscript. Files of the author, Department of Anthropology, Temple University.

Chance, Norman
1966 The Eskimo of North Alaska. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Collier, John, Jr.
1974 Review. American Anthropologist 76:717-718.

de Brigard, Emilie
1975 The History of Ethnographic Film. *In* Principles of Visual Anthropology. Paul Hockings, ed. Pp. 13-44. The Hague: Mouton.

Gerbner, George
1972 Communication and the Social Environment. Scientific American 227(3):153-160.

Graburn, Nelson
1967 The Eskimo and "Airport Art." Trans-action 4(10):28-33.
1972 *Review of* The White Dawn. American Anthropologist 74:871.

Griffith, Richard
1953 The World of Robert Flaherty. Duell, Sloan and Pearre.

Hall, Edward T.
1959 The Silent Language. New York: Anchor.

Honigmann, John
1970 *Film Review of* Caribou Hunters at the Crossing Place; Autumn River Camp; Sea Ice Camp. American Anthropologist 72:722-724.

Houston, James
1971 The White Dawn. New York: Signet.
1967 Eskimo Prints. Barre, Massachusetts: Barre Publishers.

Kiefer, Thomas M.
1974 *Film Review of* The Wedding of Palo. American Anthropologist 76:209-210.

Mead, Margaret, and Rhoda Metraux, eds.
1952 Culture at a Distance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

O'Brien, Denise
1973 Fiction as Folk Anthropology. Paper presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Radin, Paul
1955 The Literature of Primitive Peoples. Diogenes 12:1-28.

Ruesch, Hans
1951 Top of the World. New York: Pocket Books.
1973 Back to Top of the World. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Segall, Marshall, Donald Campbell, and Melville Herskovits
1966 The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Swinton, George
1965 Eskimo Sculpture. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Tomczak, Theresa
1972 Eskimo, Aleut and Indian Dances of Alaska. Focus on Dance IV. Jane Harris, ed.

Worth, Sol
1972 Toward an Anthropological Politics of Symbolic Forms. In Reinventing Anthropology. Dell Hymes, ed. Pp. 335-366. New York: Pantheon.
1976 Doing Anthropology of Visual Communication. Working Papers in Culture and Communication 1(2):2-18 Philadelphia: Department of Anthropology, Temple University.

Worth, Sol, and John Adair
1972 Through Navajo Eyes: An Exploration in Film Communication and Anthropology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

FOUR SIMULATIONS TO INCREASE UNDERGRADUATE INVOLVEMENT IN ANTHROPOLOGY COURSES

Lynn Price Ager

Fieldwork is sometimes recommended as a means of encouraging more direct involvement of undergraduate anthropology students, on the assumption that the methodology of anthropology is just as important as knowledge acquisition to an anthropological perspective. Lack of adequate training, costs in time, and the image of anthropology as a science are reasons why simulated field experiences offer promising alternatives to the risks of field work based on inadequate training in anthropological methodology. Four simulations, effective with both large and small numbers of students, involve the use of films, classmates as informants, class visitor as informant, and museum artifact analysis.

INTRODUCTION TO FIELDWORK THROUGH FILMS

A memorable way to introduce students to fieldwork is to have a class observe unnarrated films, such as the series on the Netsilik Eskimo. [*Editor's note:* See the article in this issue "Human Images" by Richard Chalfen.] Without previous training in field observation, the students are asked to imagine they are actually observing a culture in the field. Their task is to make field notes in their journals and, on the basis of their recorded observations, to write ethnographies. The ethnographies and the supporting field notes are turned into the instructor, and used as a basis for oral class presentation and analysis.

After a few presentations, it becomes immediately apparent that class observers have selected different aspects of culture to emphasize, and that, even where the same aspects are presented, they are interpreted differently. This introductory technique, which can be based on as little as one 30-minute episode of simulated observation, serves a number of purposes. It presents an understanding of subjectivity in observer perception and reporting; the difficulty of understanding the meaning of behavior without a knowledge of the language; and the intellectual task of cognitive abstraction and synthesis necessary to transform episodic notes into a finished ethnography. The dilemma of concurrent note taking and the danger of missed observation compared to recall note-taking subsequent to observation is also faced. Perhaps the most valuable aspect of such film viewing is that students become aware of the fact that no matter how scientific and authoritative an ethnography may sound, it is written by an individual dependent upon his powers of observation and interpretation.

The initial objective of this simulated field observation is to make students both more appreciative and critical of the ethnographies they will subsequently read during the course. Depending on the emphasis on anthropological methodology, the films may be used as a training device not merely to establish ethnographic empathy but to develop observational and methodological skills.

USING CLASSMATES AS INFORMANTS

Classmates can be used in many different ways as informants. A simple device in kinship teaching is to use class members to collect genealogies, which then serve as a basis for kinship analysis and diagramming. After an initial period of lecture and discussion on kinship, partners are assigned randomly from the class rolls to prevent students who are already familiar with each other from working together. The task assigned to the partners is to gain as much as possible about each other's family tree from his own knowledge, without recourse to parents, other informants, or family histories. To develop questioning skills, a rule of the simulation is for the respondent to supply only information elicited and not to volunteer data. The exercise culminates in the development of a family genealogy.

This simulation has a number of benefits. From the standpoint of class interaction, it forces students into interaction with a stranger and serves as a basis for more open class participation. From the perspective of kinship teaching, it makes students more conscious of their place in a kinship network and aware of the American kinship system. They also see that behind the impersonal diagram of a kinship system, the system represents a nexus of meaningful relationships of real people, united by warm, emotional human bonds. It also stimulates an interest in kinship. Even those who have been unable to muster even a glimmer of interest in Crow cousin terminology come alive in discussions of second cousins and first cousins once removed. Everyone, for example, has a different idea about what to call the child of a mother's cousin. This kinship assignment has brought positive feedback over repeated use, notwithstanding reservations about the appropriateness of kinship content in a lower division course.

CLASS VISITOR AS INFORMANT

Members of a community can be brought into the classroom to serve as informants when various constraints preclude student interviews in a community. The usual cautions should be exercised for selection of a resource-person-as-informant as selection of an informant in the field. An uninformed or inarticulate class visitor, chosen at random, will hardly be helpful to the class. The use of appropriate resource visitors is frequently rewarding, and may be illustrated by the following example.

In one community there was a division between white, middle-class students and an ethnic enclave they perceived as non-academically oriented. After a period of study about this ethnic group, an elderly man from that community was persuaded to come to the class to answer questions. He was shy at first, but as students began to ask questions which showed interest and empathy, he responded more warmly. Before the end of the period, he was hoarse from answering the barrage of questions. This particular visitor owned and operated a small coffee shop in his neighborhood. After his visit, some of the students from the class began to visit his shop and talk with him informally. These informal visits to the shop and the neighborhood helped these students broaden their understanding of the ethnic community. The class visit, however, served as an introduction. Utilization of such local resources can frequently be arranged without undue difficulty on the part of the instructor or class members.

MUSEUM ARTIFACT ANALYSIS

Museums provide a useful resource for anthropology teaching, even when the collection is limited. Since museums are frequently underfinanced and understaffed, it is possible that class manpower can be utilized, in connection with some kind of museum research in lieu of a library paper, to assist the museum in some practical manner.

Arrangements have been made with the local museum for students to do research. After a period of orientation by the curator, students identify a project and work under his supervision. The opportunity to handle objects, dig through old records, and utilize new research techniques capture student interest in an area not covered in most anthropology courses. The detailed analysis of the students is often helpful to the museum as well as providing a learning opportunity for students. Some students become so involved that they continue to work with the museum as volunteers after the course is over.

CONCLUSION

The four simulations described are examples of the way instructors in undergraduate anthropology may provide opportunities for students to do something other than read and listen to lectures. Simulated student involvement not only helps to maintain student interest but also to convey an idea of the relationship of anthropological knowledge to anthropological methods. Simulations may also help maintain student interest in anthropology until sufficient training has been received to conduct research with human subjects. Recommendation for more active involvement of students in learning anthropology by using anthropological methods is consistent with the historic theory of concrete learning as well as the more recent emphasis on the relationship of research methodologies to learning the structure of the discipline. The literature on simulation also indicates that it is effective as a teaching mode as well as a motivational device. Teachers of undergraduate anthropology may therefore profitably utilize more simulations in teaching and training.

CURRICULUM MODELS FOR TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY

John H. Chilcott / *University of Arizona*

During the past decade there has been an increasing interest in teaching anthropology at all grade levels in U.S. schools. National programs have been developed both through federal and private funds. Textbooks, films, simulation kits, and a wide variety of teaching methods have been generated. Perhaps this is an appropriate time to examine the nature of this development and provide some synthesis upon which future development of anthropological curricula might be based.

Prior to any heuristic model construction, the question, "Why teach anthropology?" must be answered. More often than not, however, the question *what* anthropology should be taught is the only question asked. The answer to, "What anthropology should be taught?" should depend upon the answer to, "Why teach anthropology?" The course-curriculum selection process should be secondary to the purpose for teaching anthropology.

The most common curriculum model for teaching anthropology is the subject matter model of which there may be several varieties. One such model might be referred to as the subject matter *curiosity model*, (A). The answer to the question, "Why teach anthropology?" for this model would be that anthropological data is interesting and may be self-selected through the interests of the students. In this fashion the curriculum model consists of a series of "cultural curiosities" which the teacher may include at random within the framework of the existing courses.

In this model the data is mostly descriptive with little concept formation. A typical unit of this kind was entitled, "Houses among the Indians" (fourth grade), and included a description of an Eskimo igloo, a Northwest coast plank house, a Hopi stone house, a Plains skin tepee, and a Woodland bark wigwam. No attempt was made to discuss why different materials were used in construction, why different settlement patterns existed, nor how the people lived within the houses.

Not only does this model remove cultural traits from their context, it tends to increase the opportunity for stereotyping, e.g., all Eskimos live in igloos. This approach many times encourages ethnocentrism. At a workshop in California a few years ago, some of the teachers included the following groups among a list of primitive societies: the Spanish in California, the Western pioneers, and the American colonists. Several made the distinction between primitive people and U.S. society based on the fact that primitive people had no culture. Finally, this model tends to overemphasize material culture to the neglect of other features of a culture such as social organization, religion, and politics. Among this same group of teachers, only 10% included the nonmaterial features of the societies which their students were studying.

The fact that many abuses of anthropological data can be perpetrated through this model does not suggest that the model, with some revision, can become more effective. A teacher utilizing this model should have a series of concepts in mind which should emerge from the basic data presented. Additionally, the teacher should study fewer cultures more intensively in order for the child to perceive himself as a member of the society under study, to judge the cultural traits in terms of the cultural values of the specific culture, and to seek an appreciation for the best in that culture.

Another variety of the subject matter model might be referred to as the *separate course* or subject matter model, (B). This is usually the approach in secondary education. In this model the data of anthropology is presented in such a fashion as to "cover" the subject with little or no attempt to integrate the data with other subject matter areas. A common procedure within this model is to examine introductory textbooks in anthropology as a source in selecting topics. Oftentimes, included in the selection process, is a concern for the level of sophistication of the data to be selected. Once the anthropological topics have been selected, (the biases of the author(s) may be perceived), energy is expended in selecting a variety of techniques and materials to present the data. Some examples of this model would include the *Anthropology Curriculum Project* of the University of Georgia, *Patterns in Human History* by Macmillan Company, and *Inquiring about Cultures* program by Holt, Rinehart and Winston.[1] The *Databank* of the latter project graphically illustrates the richness of materials which have been developed for teaching anthropology under this model.

One of the major drawbacks to the separate course model is that so few teachers have any coursework in anthropology and therefore lack confidence in their ability to teach the materials. On occasion, special institutes and workshops have been organized to train the teachers in anthropology. In spite of these "crash projects," many teachers' knowledge of anthropology remains at a very superficial level. As more anthropology undergraduate majors enter the teaching profession, this problem may be

TABLE 1. VARIETIES OF ANTHROPOLOGY SUBJECT MATTER MODELS

Model	*Source of Data*	*Selecting Agency*	*Style of Curriculum Package*	*Increase in Knowledge about Anthropology Required*
(A) Curiosity	Texts, films, etc.	Teacher	Added to existing courses, units, etc. (descriptive)	
(B) Separate Course	Text or packaged program	Author or university staff	Separate course (descriptive and conceptual)	
(C) Integrated	Variety of materials, booklets, films, etc.	Teacher	Integrated within existing course (conceptual)	
(D) Case Study	Ethnographic data	Teacher	Separate units or integrated within existing courses (conceptual)	
(E) Generalizations	Statewide committees, school and university faculty	Curriculum committee	Integrated and reinforced at all levels of curriculum (conceptual)	

ameliorated. Additionally, a separate course in anthropology must compete with other courses such as economics, sociology, political science, and psychology—some of which might be less threatening to administrators and school boards.[2]

Still another variety of the subject matter model is one which might be referred to as the *integrated subject matter model*, (C). In this model the concepts and data of anthropology are utilized by teachers from a wide variety of teaching backgrounds in *already existing courses*. I found this model to be particularly nonthreatening to teachers during several summers of directing NSF summer institutes. It also avoids a number of the problems suggested for the separate course model. The major reason to teach anthropology in this model is to enhance the already existing curricula. The process might be referred to as *additive integration*. Thus the biology teacher would add such topics as human evolution, human genetics, human nutrition, and micro-races to the already existing subject matter content. The world history teacher would include the notion of cultural diffusion, e.g., the fact that European technology moved from 8th century China through Islam to Europe, in a space time continuum—the process of urbanization from archaeological evidence, and concepts of culture change, e.g., the impact of Western technology on native peoples. The Humanities-English teacher would include folklore, oral history, some notions of so-called primitive religion, and of course, linguistics. Within this model the teacher is presented with the notion of priorities, i.e., what kinds of information have the greatest magnitude of explanation. The assumption here is that some anthropological concepts are more "powerful" than some of the previous information being presented in the course and therefore can replace these.

Surprisingly enough, this particular model has received very little attention in the literature on teaching anthropology, yet I found, during numerous follow-up studies of teachers who had studied anthropology, that this approach was being used by extremely creative teachers far more than the separate course approach (see Chilcott 1963). I soon discovered that biology and history teachers did not want to become anthropology teachers, but that they more than welcomed anthropological data and theory to augment the courses which they were already teaching.

A variety of the subject model which is nearly nonexistent so far as I can tell, might be referred to as the *case study model*, (D). Although much data may be presented in other subject matter models, none of them rely on a case study approach to analyze this data. This approach has been used to some extent at the college level, but not at the precollegiate level. I rather suspect that there are two major reasons for this approach to be so scarce. First, there are no case study materials prepared for use at the precollegiate level. Second, the case study approach requires that the teacher play a passive rather than an active role in the teaching of the data. It is a model which should prove to be useful, particularly to the less academically inclined students for whom some problem-solving based on anthropological perspectives might contribute to their "survival strategies" in the modern world.

The final variety of the subject matter model attempts to avoid what could easily be a laissez-faire approach to teaching anthropology. I should like to refer to it as a *generalizations subject matter model*, (E). In this model a series of anthropological generalizations which can aid the student to understand the nature of man are *first* developed and then the anthropological data are selected on the basis of which data and methods best create these understandings

in children. Such generalizations might include:

(1) Man has developed to his present form through the same process of biological evolution as the rest of the animal kingdom.

(2) Although man is a member of the animal kingdom, he differs profoundly from other creatures by virtue of his development of culture.

(3) No modern society has invented more than a small fraction of its cultural heritage—each owes tremendous debts to cultural innovators of other times and other places.

(4) The culture under which a person is reared exerts a powerful influence on him throughout his life.

(5) Human beings, regardless of their racial and ethnic heritage, are nearly all capable of participating in and contributing to any culture.

(6) A person with anthropological knowledge about human variation, both physical and cultural, will more easily adapt to social and cultural change.[3]

It occurs to me that the generalizations subject matter model is the ideal model for teaching subject matter inasmuch as the generalizations can be presented at any grade level and reinforced with greater sophistication at a higher level with older students. These generalizations are sufficiently broad to be incorporated in nearly any type of learning experience and need not be restricted to a particular course or unit of study. I would classify the *Man: A Course of Study* project under this model as its major focus in developing an understanding of what it is to be human, and includes in its materials concepts from both psychology and anthropology. Other projects include the California Council on Social Studies and the Milwaukee Social Studies Project.

A second major type of curriculum model which also has a series of varieties, may be termed the *total curriculum model*. Under this model an anthropological framework serves as the basis for organizing the *total* school curriculum, rather than organizing a portion of the subject matter within the curriculum.

Perhaps the simplest variety of the total curriculum model might be referred to as the *developmental model*, (A), which focuses on the evolution of man and his culture. A brief description of such a model follows:

At the fourth grade level (at which time the students presumably are capable of reading), present a description of early human society utilizing the archaeological evidence and compare it with an ethnographic description of a hunting and foraging society (band).

At the fifth grade level, present a description of two tribal societies; one which still relies on hunting and foraging, and another in which domesticated plants and/or animals have been introduced. Make a comparison in terms of commonalities between the two societies and the band society studied in the fourth grade. Analyze differences between the three societies in terms of cultural adaptation to the environment, cultural persistence, effect of increased size on the sociocultural integration of the group, and the effect of the introduction of domesticated plants and animals on the group.

At the sixth grade level, study a society at the chiefdom level of sociocultural integration as well as the prehistoric evidence for societies at this level. Examine some qualitative as well as quantitative changes which occur at this level through comparison with tribal societies. At this time the emergence of political, social, religious, and economic institutions can also be examined along with the emergence of technology.

At the seventh grade level, two primitive states would be studied in both terms of commonalities between them and in terms of changes which have occurred as a result of greatly increased size and urbanization. Further analyses of the emergence of institutions, technology, science, mathematics and literacy, if present, would be provided.

The eighth grade would review the prehistory of man until the time of Western civilization in terms of urbanization, the emergence of science, mathematics and architecture, as well as modern political, religious, social, and economic institutions—all in terms of a space and time continuum. The major focus would be on preparing the

TABLE 2. VARIETIES OF TOTAL CURRICULUM MODELS

Model	*Source of Data*	*Selecting Agency*	*Style*
(A) Developmental	Archaeology, history, ethnography	Anthropologist and teachers	Evolutionary—simple to complex
(B) Sociocultural analysis	Modern American culture	Social scientists	Linton's typology
(C) Ecohistorical model	Societal knowledge	Natural selection through evolution of knowledge	Transactional—culture change
(D) Natural History	Interaction between culture and curriculum	Scholars	Evolutionary—natural selection
(E) Social Reconstructionism	Culture history	Students, teachers, scholars	Decision making process as to the nature of future society

student to move with greater understanding into the study of modern mathematics and science. Topics common to earth science, geography, literature, art, and music would already have been studied in concert with the study of nonliterate societies, both modern and prehistoric.

The ninth grade would study the emergence of Western civilization in terms of culture change. One approach might consist of an intensive study of Homeric Greece and the Golden Age, noting changes that occurred between these time periods and accounting for these changes. As in the eighth grade, the development of *all* features of Western cultural development would be examined through the process of ecohistorical analysis.

The tenth grade would examine Western cultural development in terms of the development of modern states and cities. As usual, the comparative approach would be the major mechanism for analysis; comparing the primitive states studied in the seventh grade with modern states—both in terms of cultural persistence and in terms of qualitative changes in all segments of human life.

The eleventh grade would examine the nature of colonialism; economic, political, and ideological with special emphasis upon the impact of Western civilization upon Eastern and traditional cultures. In this sense, this year focuses upon international relations.

The twelfth and final year would focus upon the nature of American society through an ecohistorical cultural analysis. The major focus in this year would be to draw upon the anthropological skills in analyzing the nature of man and his cultural development to assist the students in their own self-realization as to where modern American society was derived and the cultural reasons for modern day thinking, behaving, and valuing.

There are several assumptions throughout this model. They are that there exists a core of knowledge and concepts about man which can provide a basic curriculum from which all other curricular topics can be derived. That cultural development can be examined in terms of increasing complexity, increasing spacial occupation of human complexity, and significant changes in life style as a result of increasing size of population.

A second total curriculum model might be referred to as the *sociocultural analysis model*, (B). The basis for this model is Ralph Linton's notion of cultural universals, specialties, alternatives, and idiosyncratic behavior (Linton 1936:272-274). It is based upon the degree of sharedness of cultural patterns within the population. For example, a cultural universal, using Linton's terms, would be those cultural behaviors, concepts, and values which all Americans would share. In a modern industrial society, the number of commonly shared cultural traits is markedly reduced. Some examples would be the belief in the U.S. Constitution, the use of a common money system, and, of course, the belief in universal education. Using this analysis of American society, the traits, beliefs, and values would be determined and then included in a core-program for all children.

In Linton's terms, specialties are those behaviors shared by some segments of the society but not by all. The ethnic minority groups, some vocations such as bankers, and social classes have their own cultural norms. These would be isolated and taught as special programs within the curriculum in the form of ethnic studies, vocational studies, fine arts, etc.

Cultural alternatives are differing ways of behaving in response to the same social demand. For example, most Americans believe in the existence of a supernatural, but the manner in which this belief is expressed may vary from attendance at high mass in the cathedral, to contemplating nature while playing golf on Sunday. These cultural traits would be incorporated into the curriculum as electives.

Idiosyncratic behavior would be included in the curriculum as independent study at all levels. All children would participate in the core-program but to varying degrees in the special programs, electives, and independent study, depending on their desire to participate in these segments of the society.

The *ecohistorical model*, (C), of curriculum construction is one which may also be referred to as a *transactional model* in the sense that cultural knowledge is examined without rigid boundaries and not in terms of interacting pairs of correlates. The concept of school curriculum would be analogous to that of a fish pond wherein all aspects of the fish pond are interpenetrating each other, have a natural history, are in a state of homeostasis which can be disrupted from time to time through ecological succession. In such a model, aspects of the curriculum would have to contribute to the total welfare of the curriculum or be eliminated and succeeded by another piece of cultural knowledge which is more vital to the equilibrium of the curriculum. I would suspect that just as there are cultural survivals—cultural traits which survive, albeit with new meaning, so too would there be curriculum survivals. A classic example might be the teaching of Latin; an old subject with new meaning. Latin is no longer taught as a means to studying the bible, but rather to improve one's English and/or as access to the intellectual elite. Obviously within this model there would be no courses but rather cultural information, some of which persists, dies out, or is replaced with "new" cultural information (actually the recombination of older cultural elements).

The *natural history (ethnographic) model*, (D), of curriculum construction attempts to perceive the continuing patterns of cultural development through four processes of analysis. The first process is an analysis of constants over time. One could focus on the culture or the curriculum, or both, in looking for persisting systems of information. These systems could be disrupted by a system break; in the case of culture: an invasion; in the case of the curriculum: the Russian *Sputnik*. The second process involves looking at the life cycle of cultural traits. If you know the age of something, you know something about it. Thus, people, cars, ideas—all have life cycles.

The third process is to examine learning and cultural

evolution through mutation and selection; the creation of new images in the mind. Knowledge is fundamentally unpredictable. One cannot predict what life will be like 25 years hence on the basis of what we know today.

The final process is to examine learning as a process of coming to decision points wherein one must select from a series of possible futures which depend upon values. Therefore one must learn not only the possible alternatives, but the values placed on each and why. Anthropological information should teach about other alternatives and values.

My personal preference for a total curriculum model would be one which might be referred to as *social reconstruction*, (E). The basic assumption of this model is that culture is a tool of man which he can use to adapt to both the natural and the human environment; that the major goal of all societies is to make life easier, more secure, and more satisfying—satisfying in the sense that the individual's education has provided a greater understanding of what he sees and why people behave the way they do.

The function of education therefore is primarily to help people individually and collectively to cope with society and ultimately to improve society. The humanistic aspects of anthropology can assist in the definition of a "good society," through an examination of cultural definitions of what is "good." The culturalogical aspects of anthropology can contribute to strategies for approaching this definition; those which may prove to be more successful than others.

Such a model would view American society as dynamic rather than static. There would be constant reevaluation of the definition of a good society and the strategies which can be employed to reconstitute society.

Education then is more than the transmission of culture from one generation to another, but can and should be the transmission of skills and information to transform culture in a direction deemed desirable by the society.

NOTES

[1] For an evaluation of these projects see Thomas L. Dynneson, *Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials*, 1975, Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia, Athens.

[2] During a follow-up of participants in a summer NSF institute in anthropology, it was discovered that several teachers were not permitted to order materials nor to initiate anthropology coursework due to "administrative resistance." See also Dorothy Nelkin, "Science Textbook Controversies," *Scientific American*, April 1974, pp. 33-39.

[3] This is a partial list taken from the *California Council on Social Studies* Report, 1963. (mimeo)

REFERENCES CITED

Anthropology Curriculum Project
1964 University of Georgia, Athens.

Chilcott, John H.
1963 A Follow-Up Study of a National Science Foundation Summer Institute in Anthropology. Paper presented at the 62nd Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. Anthropology Curriculum Project. University of Georgia, Athens.

Linton, Ralph
1936 The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Man: A Course of Study
1967 Washington, D.C.: Curriculum Development Associates.

Nelkin, Dorothy
1974 Science Textbook Controversies. Scientific American 234:33-39.

Owen, Roger C.
1972 Inquiring about Cultures. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Patterns in Human History
1971 New York: Macmillan.

TEACHING ANTHROPOLOGY AS SCIENCE AT THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

Al Dacanay, Jr. / *Lincoln Senior Elementary School, Stockton, California*

This paper describes an elective anthropology course[1] for eighth grade students taught in 1974-75 and 1975-76 in the Lincoln Senior Elementary School, Stockton, California. The course is offered as part of the science rather than social studies program, and thus emphasizes physical anthropology and archaeology with laboratory and field methods. The content, although difficult, is within the grasp of motivated average and above eighth grade students. Evaluation, utilizing an informal teacher constructed inventory, indicates that 66% of the response to the 1975-76 course were rated good or excellent on a five-point scale. Forty-seven of the respondents would recommend the course to someone else, but nine would not. Community as well as pupil acceptance has been favorable, and it is planned to continue offering the course as a science elective. Training in anthropology is necessary to teach a course with the laboratory and scientific focus in the course described.

BACKGROUND AND ORGANIZATION

In recent years, there has been an accelerated interest in the relationship of anthropology to education and to the social sciences and natural sciences in particular. Anthropology as the "study of man and his works," with its traditional interests in cultural process and in language, race, and human evolution, is a potential contributer to a good general education at all levels of educational experience.

With this concept in mind, in fall 1974 a one-year course was begun on a trial basis at Lincoln Senior Elementary School as an elective for eighth graders who wished to expand their science interests. The majority of the students who elected the course were tracked in the average to above average class rankings. However, the curriculum was planned to meet the needs of all students, with more personal assistance given to the low track student. Consequently, even students with low reading ability have benefited from this program.

Enrollment in the course was limited to 56 students, divided into two classes of 28 students each. The classes met every other day in 90-minute, double periods. The double period length lent itself to structuring laboratory and activity programs. Since the course was a full year course, the units were offered in quarter sequences. The first quarter was devoted to the beginnings of anthropology as a subject and paleontology; the second quarter, the study of the physical and behavioral aspects of nonhuman primates and genetics; the third, archaeology, and the fourth, cultural anthropology, including language and symbolic thought.

The course was repeated in 1975-76, following the 1974 format described below. A major change was in the site of the archaeological excavation, which provided more recoverable materials and engendered more pupil enthusiasm and participation. Details of the offerings by quarter are given in the next sections, written in the present tense as a continuing teaching plan.

FIRST QUARTER-PALEONTOLOGY

The first quarter focuses on the beginnings of anthropology as a subject, with emphasis on some of its controversial issues and the contribution it can make to human affairs. The origin of the solar system, earth, and the scientific view of the origin of life is elaborated upon. The relationships between the geological time scale and extinct and living life forms and their changes through time are noted, with the observation that man was one of the last species to evolve. The principles of evolutionary theory commensurate with human origins and the development of man's capacity for culture is discussed. Special emphasis is given to the study of early hominid forms, such as Ramapithecus, Australopithecus, Homo erectus, Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon man. Slides taken from *Time-Life* Books and skull casts add further enrichment.

The latter part of the first quarter enters the anthropometric phase of the Early Man unit. Using sections of the *Laboratory Manual for Introductory Physical Anthropology* (Dave Racowsky and Thomas Hay, University of Missouri-St. Louis), the students observe parts of the human skeleton, particularly the skull features, pelvis, vertebrae, and long bones, and identify the laboratory illustrations. With an anthropometric recording sheet, osteometric board, and sliding and spreading calipers, the students then take measurements between anatomical landmarks and record them. Skull cast specimens include Australopithecus, Homo erectus, Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon man, plus a few skulls recovered from previous archaeological excavations. The sexing and aging of the

skull and pelvis as well as determining the height of a person by measuring the lower limbs is also emphasized. The students then begin to see the changes and variability in the skeletal features of man, especially the evolutionary morphological trends found in prehistoric man. Continued measurements and observations are drawn from skull casts of orangutan, chimpanzee, and a gorilla.

SECOND QUARTER-NONHUMAN PRIMATES AND GENETICS

The second quarter involves the study of the physical and behavioral aspects of nonhuman primates and their significance in analyzing human behavior. Case histories of various nonhuman primates and what scientists have learned in the laboratory and field are studied. Field studies concerning the chimpanzees, orangutans, and gorilla is the main emphasis.

Toward the end of the second quarter, a simple and brief exposure to basic genetics is dealt with. The students are exposed to the reasons and mechanisms which underlie the biological and evolutionary changes of racial and physical variations found in man. Basic genetic exercises are taken from the *Laboratory Manual for Introductory Physical Anthropology* (Racowsky and Hay). The ABO blood sampling test is administered to the class as well as having the students trace their family tree by the construction of a genealogical chart with respect to the color of eyes and color of hair.

THIRD QUARTER-ARCHAEOLOGY

The third quarter finds the student involved in the arduous task of manufacturing primitive tools from obsidian with the use of hammerstones and antler tips. Before the actual chipping begins, the students are oriented through readings and illustrations of the various prehistoric tool cultures, such as Oldowan, Acheulean, and Mousterian. With respect to the above tool stages, the student then draws examples of the tools he wishes to manufacture from obsidian. The instructor demonstrates the methods and techniques in shaping a tool. Indeed, with a few cuts and scrapes, the students gain a greater appreciation of the patience and task that prehistoric man and Native American had in the making of tools.

The latter part of the third and much of the fourth quarter finds the student involved in archaeology. This unit is presented so that the student is aware that archaeology is a science steeped in the scientific method of research and techniques. The purpose of archaeology in the reconstruction of the past as well as methods and processes used by archaeologists are examined.

Orientation of this unit begins by showing a series of slides of previous excavations supplemented with lectures and readings. The importance of correct archaeological procedures, the taking of careful and organized notes, and proper labeling of recorded materials is given due emphasis. The different kinds of sites, site recognition, and the various dating procedures is presented.

Thus, before there is an actual participation of the students in an excavation, they have good exposure to the proper techniques and procedures for uncovering and interpreting a site.

FOURTH QUARTER-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Cultural anthropology during the last and fourth quarter brings the year to a close. In the previous units, it is brought out that three factors interact to account for man's evolution: biological, environmental, and the systematic use and spread of tools. This unit dwells on the beginnings of man's cultural development from two sources: from inferences drawn by archaeologists from artifacts recovered, and from information recorded by anthropologists observing "Stone Age" people living today. Both Old World and New World Prehistory are considered. The student thus sees the development and sequence of major cultural trends and cultural changes from the first societies to the beginnings of cities.

Cultural elemental features (food getting, housing, law and order, religion, status and role, and mating and marriage), are discussed. Examples are given by the instructor of other societies and their cultural systems. A list of societies of the world representing a variety of subsistence levels are given to the student. Each student writes a report, complete with bibliography, relating the cultural elemental features of their respective society. Available films and filmstrips from the public library and our own resource center supplements this unit.

This unit also includes the study and origin of language and symbolic thought. Man the mind, man the symbolic cultural creature, man's unique ability to communicate with others is the focus of the study, supplemented with a consideration of kinesics (body language) and proximics (territory). The interrelation of body language with spoken language to control human behavior and to maintain social order is considered, with a comparison of nonhuman primate and other mammalian behavior. Individual mobility within the social hierarchy is also studied in relation to territorial and dominance behavior. Finally, students act out various body and territorial language approaches to simulate nonverbal communication.

The final weeks of the year look at the future of man in terms of his relationship to the destiny of the earth. An ecological-environmental emphasis is utilized, in which the student considers the extent to which intelligent resource use can preserve his planet. The book *Future Shock* provides examples of some of the changes the environment is now experiencing, as well as problems and expectations students may face in the future.

MATERIAL FOR THE COURSE

The course does not utilize one textbook but a reading list correlated with the topics of study annotated by

reading level. This permits students to adjust selection to reading level. For example, in the paleontology quarter a unit is entitled "The Search for Adam and Eve." Suggested reading includes selections from Arthur Gregor, *The Adventure of Man*, which is classified as to reading level as fair-easy; Howell Clark, *Early Man*, classified as excellent-average; and W. L. Clark, *Man-Apes or Ape-Men*, classified as excellent-advanced.

The library has cooperated in the anthropology course by increasing the number of anthropology titles. Many of these are lent to the course, and serve as a classroom library. To facilitate use, class readings are drawn from the titles available in the classroom library. In addition to the basic reading list, supplementary reading articles are distributed.

Much of the framework for the physical anthropology quarter is adapted from *Physical Anthropology Today* (Communications Research Machines, 1971). This book is also available to students, and is sometimes read by students with good reading facility.

Enhancement and supplement to the program are provided by the resource center at Lincoln school. Among the audio-filmstrips used are the following: *Man on the Move* series (Miller-Brady Productions, 1971), *What Is Anthropology?* (Education Audio-Visual Inc., 1973), and *The Stone Age* series (B.F.A. Educational Media, 1969). Slides taken from the various Time-Life Books are also used. An added facility is the audio-television studio at the high school. Programs on television can be taped and played back for the classroom. Programs taped for classroom use include, *The Primal Man* series, Jane Goodall and her work with chimpanzees and baboon, and *In Search of Ancient Astronauts*. Films are also available from the City Library.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK

Archaeological fieldwork is a major aspect of the program, and was introduced in the first year course in 1975. In 1976, the class was involved in excavating at a Native American site 25 miles north of Stockton. It was partially excavated in the past, but the site is so extensive that it promises to provide an opportunity for continued laboratory work in field archaeology. Dating estimates place the site between 3,800-5,200 years old. In 1976, excavation was conducted over a period of nine Saturdays, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Similar training, described in the next paragraphs, will be conducted in the spring of 1977.

Using the techniques of micromethodology, a stake is marked on the site which serves as a reference point from which measurements are made and square areas are outlined in the pattern of a numbered grid. The units are marked off at 150 centimeters squared. The topsoil is cleared of field grasses and the soil removed in horizontal layers with trowels and loose dirt picked up by a hand shovel. Excavation is done ten centimeters at a time, and the location of each artifact is recorded by precise measurements on a three-dimensional grid. Scrupulous controls are maintained in all phases of excavation and record keeping. Three students are assigned to each unit. On a rotating basis, one is troweling, the other scraping the loose soil, and a third is screening and examining the materials found. All three students are, however, responsible for the note-taking, labeling and illustrations.

As the dirt is taken from a grid, it is sifted through a 1/8-inch wire mesh. The materials remaining in the screen are preserved. Bits of shells, baked clay, bones, and other animal remains, together with fragments of modified or unmodified lithics, are gathered and placed in plastic capsules and bags and labeled according to level. Each artifact or material of value is listed in a notebook by identifying label, location (grid and level number), and description, complete with graph and illustrations. Anything of importance has to be located both vertically and horizontally. Thus a pattern of living can perhaps be determined by the location of the newly found material.

The unit bags containing materials are then brought to the classroom for eventual laboratory work by the same excavators. At the laboratory, detailed and organized work is of extreme importance. After the cleaning of the materials they are cataloged and described in a laboratory write-up sheet, and again placed in capsules and level bags. All large bones, baked clay, and the burials uncovered are coated with a preservative. Each unit is then given a designated drawer where additional materials can be added and information drawn.

I thought this year's excavation was much more successful than last year's excavation in terms of recovered materials and actual participation by the students. There were 13 units excavated and only seven could be considered completely excavated. There were two complete burials and about ten disturbed burials uncovered, due perhaps to earlier rampaging and pothunters. There was a good amount of chert artifacts, including scrapers, cores, and projectile points. A few obsidian projectile points were also recovered. Since the site was rockless, an unusual amount of baked clay was found. In fact, clay with fingernail marks was common with burials, both disturbed or undisturbed. Shell and baked clay pecan beads and numerous fish, bird, and animal bones made up the rest of the recovery.

Actual excavation with follow-up laboratory work with the recovered material not only teaches scientific methodology but helps to maintain a high level of student interest. Eighth grade students enjoy the concrete learning experiences and activity afforded by archaeological excavation and interpretation.

COURSE EVALUATION

There has been a very positive feedback from the school community at large and the administration. The course has also been well received by the public. Parents have been especially impressed with the archaeological phase of the program, and in 1975 one of our excavations was given city

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS TO ANTHROPOLOGY COURSE, LINCOLN SENIOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SPRING 1976

Item	*Number of Students Responding to Rating*					
	Poor	Fair	Above Average	Good	Excellent	Total
Interest of Class	1	5	8	25	17	
Teaching Techniques	0	7	12	26	11	
Evaluation of Grades	1	8	6	22	19	
Lectures and Class Discussions	2	5	14	21	14	
Helpfulness of Teacher Toward Students	2	13	7	22	12	
Variety of Work	0	6	2	13	35	
Work Load	3	6	12	26	9	
Reading Assignments	6	13	13	15	9	
I would Recommend This Class to Someone Else						47
I would not Recommend this class to Someone Else						9

newspaper coverage, complete with pictures.

Student interest in the course is indicated by the fact that it is an elective. For the two years it has been offered, the number of available positions—56—have been fully elected. Student participation in fieldwork is another indication of interest. Participation in field trips and excavations are not required, but are on a voluntary basis. Although as many as 42 students have gone on a dig, the average participation is about 25 per outing. More than 85% of the students have participated in at least two or more excavations, a high level of participation considering that the digs are voluntary. Teachers involved in archaeological work should expect that only a small number of students will participate on a regular basis. This group forms a small cadre of motivated students who provide the needed continuity for program execution.

Students' acceptance of the course was measured in spring 1976 by an instructor prepared informal inventory, summarized in Table 1. The responses were anonymous, so that students could respond to the course in accordance with their reaction. As noted in Table 1, the responses were not uniformly favorable. Eighteen percent of the responses were fair or poor. However, 84% of the respondents indicated they would recommend the course to someone else. The anonymous type of response used did not permit follow-up interviews to discover the specific reasons of student dissatisfaction, an evaluation step necessary to reduce course dissatisfaction. The course is comparatively demanding, and some of the unfavorable rating might result from a difference between student expectations in electing the course and the nature of the assignments required. The results of the two years of teaching the course has led to the decision of the Lincoln Senior Elementary School to continue offering an anthropology course at the senior elementary level as long as students show an interest and the community feels that the course has a place in the education of their children.

I would like to conclude this article with some personal observations. Since I've been teaching, I have always held the opinion that anthropology can and should make a contribution to general education more widely than it does at present. It should not be taught just to graduate students training to become professional anthropologists, nor merely as an introduction to a scholarly discipline. Rather, it should be taught as an introduction to a new perspective on human life, as a way of thinking that we might call "humanistic objectivity." Anthropology thus has a place in pre-college as well as college education.

At the grade level that I'm teaching, and with the type of program involved in planning and instructing this anthropology class, I personally don't feel teachers without training could adequately teach this course. Adequate teaching of anthropology requires of the teacher, just as the students, the ability to look at his own or another culture objectively, to control value judgments, and to curtail prejudicial viewpoints should they arise. Anthropology deals with concepts of culture, cultural similarities and differences, race, and evolution. Many of these concepts are easily misinterpreted. Uninformed teachers might make serious errors that are all the more serious because the concepts are so powerful. It is important that teachers who are going to use anthropological concepts and data get good training in anthropology, whether they teach at the elementary, junior high, or high school levels. Without training in anthropology, I would not have had the expertise to carry out the teaching of anthropology as a science. I would like to conclude by recommending that more anthropology be taught in the pre-college years and that more teachers receive training in anthropology.

NOTES

[1] Copies of syllabi and reading lists for the course may be obtained by writing directly to Mr. Dacanay.

ANTHROPOLOGY LEARNING CENTERS: AN ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Ann G. Lauderdale / *Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo*

Learning centers are often utilized as a method of individualizing instruction and adjusting learning rate to students with a wide aptitude range. Learning centers may also be utilized to provide additional subject matter to more able students in an enrichment program. This paper describes the Anthropology Learning Centers Enrichment Program developed by volunteer parents for children achieving at or above grade level in grades three through six in a Michigan elementary school in the period February-May 1975.

BACKGROUND

The school wished to take positive action to achieve a series of interrelated goals –individualization of instruction, self-directed learning, intellectual expansion, and satisfaction as a learner. Learning centers were selected as a means for achieving the first two goals. As defined by Kaplan et al. (1973:21), a learning center is "an area in the classroom which contains a collection of activities and materials to teach, reinforce, and/or enrich a skill or concept." Anthropology, a subject not systematically included in the curriculum, was selected to achieve the goal of intellectual stimulus. It was thought that the interaction of the first three procedures would contribute to the fourth goal-improved learner satisfaction.

THE LEARNING CENTERS

Fourteen learning centers were developed, embracing the topics material needs, man a unique primate, geological time line, self-expression, paleontology, adventure of a pebble, Indian, folklore, social behavior, family of man, culture contact, crafts, tiny theatre, if you were. Each learning center was characterized by specific behavioral objectives, concepts, and content. Direction, instruction, and task cards provided guidance for students to use the learning center. Four of the learning centers are described briefly.

The content of the Paleontology center consisted of a fossil teaching kit, references, a vocabulary list, and a list of questions. The concepts emphasized were environmental change and adaptation. Behavioral objectives including observational skills and finding answers through research. In contrast, the Crafts center was activity oriented around five crafts--sand-painting, drawing petroglyphs, use of the pump drill, corn grinding, and making Ojo de Dios. The concept emphasized was that each craft had a cultural history. Behavioral objectives included following directions, using tools and materials productively, and cooperating with others. Tiny Theatre was a visual center that emphasized the use of visual materials in anthropology. If You Were . . . was a role playing activity, used at the culmination of each group experience, in which students pretended to be a member of a particular culture group.

The learning centers were placed in an empty classroom, and were located on walls, tables, the floor, and in display booths. They were subsequently relocated for middle school use in a larger, portable classroom. An important part of many centers was a book containing comparative pictures of different cultural groups and individuals performing activities corresponding to the themes of the center. Explanatory inserts could be changed to meet the reading and comprehension level of the students. Community volunteers donated materials and developed the centers under the direction of the author and a master teacher, Mrs. Marguerite Carlson. Kingman Museum, Battle Creek and the Anthropology Department of Western Michigan University freely loaned artifacts and exhibits, most of which could be touched.

PROCEDURES

Rotation in the learning centers was sequentially scheduled to include selected third and fourth grade students for four half-day sessions and for fifth and sixth grade students for from three to five half-day sessions. Originally, 112 third and fourth grade students were selected on the basis of ability to read at or above grade level and be sufficiently advanced to be released from their regular studies. Teachers selected their most able students. Usually, there were 12 students in the room for each session, which permitted students to work through the various learning centers. Subsequently, in response to pressure from students not selected to participate, entire third and fourth grade classes were permitted to visit the learning center room for a half-day experience. The previously chosen students who had worked through the centers served as guides for their classmates.

As a result of this experience, fifth and sixth grade

students, accompanied by their teachers, participated as classes in the larger quarters to which the centers were moved.

Student participation was voluntary, and students could withdraw from the program. In an introductory session, the rationale and structure, room procedures, and use of the learning centers were discussed. The students were also presented with a few basic anthropological concepts. Each student was given a Room Book in which to record task activities, observational notes, questions, and research data. They also kept Journals in which to record feelings, accomplishments, and criticisms. No grades or tests were given. The Room Books were reviewed by the staff and returned with comments. The Journals were retained by the staff as part of the evaluation data.

At the beginning of each daily session, students were divided into three groups coordinated with the required learning centers and a craft project. These assignments rotated at each session, but provisions were made for students needing more time at a center. On completion of the center activities, the student moved to another. Students were not discouraged from working with each other. Although self-direction was emphasized, immediate assistance was given, on a one-to-one basis, when there was doubt or frustration.

The staff consisted of community volunteers and classroom teachers. There was always a certified teacher present in the learning center room, with at least two other adult staff. When possible, the classroom teacher participated. The co-directors evaluated the daily activities of students and staff, and modified or changed the centers and procedures to better serve the students. They also kept teachers, administrators, parents, and school board members informed about the program and elicited their suggestions and criticisms.

EVALUATION

The Anthropology Learning Centers Program was innovative, but it was not intended to be an experiment in education or in anthropology. Evaluation was based on participant-observation, teacher and volunteer interviews, student Journals and taped interviews, parental opinions, and the comments of educational observers, school administrators, and news reporters.

The success of students in a self-directed learning environment is greatly dependent upon the role of the adult staff. In this Program the sources of information and instruction were the Learning Centers. The task of the adult was to be emotionally supportive to the students, and to facilitate the use of the Centers and the room. Frequently it was the non-professional, volunteer staff who were most comfortable in this role. The professional staff indicated that they sometimes became frustrated, even annoyed, at the noise, movement, and independent attitudes of the students. Added to this was the frustration of a lack of familiarity with anthropology.

The classroom teachers supported the Program but wanted it for selected, gifted and able students only. They felt that students needed a longer time in the Program, and also opportunities to go to the room on an individual released-time basis.

The Anthropology Learning Centers Program was described as "fun" in 157 of 159 collected student Journals. It was described as "neat" in the remaining two. The reasons most frequently given for enjoying the experience were:

> . . . it is new . . . because you don't learn just by books, you learn by doing, that's the real way . . . there's something to do all the time . . . you could move around . . . be creative . . . it feels good in here . . . they let you do it by yourself . . . like working together . . . liked to know how other people live . . . liked the picture books . . . because I learned a lot . . .

The most often expressed complaints were that:

> . . . we were too rushed . . . was too noisy . . . too many people (fifth and sixth grade) . . . had to wait for Centers (fifth and sixth grades) . . . not enough tapes . . . cannot stay longer . . . can't come back for the rest of the year.

The gifted and able students excelled in assuming responsibility for their learning activities, following directions, and completing tasks. However, initially, these students were concerned about the lack of grades, tests, and competition. They were unwilling to believe that their opinion was a sufficient response to a question. The less able students were delighted with these arrangements. The selected students eagerly shared their experiences and learnings with their regular classmates. All students commented about the fact that in the Program no one could *fail*. According to their teachers, three "underachieving" students became enthusiastic learners as a result of being in the Program.

ACHIEVEMENT OF GOALS

The evaluation showed that the goal of individualized learning had been met through the use of the learning centers. The center design met a variety of student needs and abilities.

The learning centers were less successful, however, in meeting the goal of self-directed learning. Most of the students had little experience in choosing learning activities, scheduling their time, and assuming responsibility for study. Many students at first plunged into the centers, neglecting to fully follow instructions, absorb information, or complete tasks thoughtfully. The abler students showed quick growth in self-direction and self-discipline. The less able students, however, were more impatient and relied on adult assistance throughout. All of the students appeared to increase their skills in manipulation of tools and audiovisual materials.

Since no tests were given, it is difficult to know to what extent the stimulation of intellectual growth was fostered. The Room Books and group discussions indicated that the more able students used the anthropological materials as basis for perceptive judgments and valid generalizations

about human behavior. All of the students responded enthusiastically to the content of the various centers.

The fourth goal of enhancing the image of the student as a learner was most striking with students whose records showed them to be under- or non-achievers. The following testimonial from a student Journal reflects a common theme:

> I like this class because I have learned a lot. I thank you a lot for all you have done .... It's like being a new me. I really feel great about it. I go home and I feel like I've been to a new world. K. D., 3rd grade, March 26, 1975.

Copies of the Anthropology Learning Centers have been used successfully in a city school system for a variety of students by media teachers. The learning centers described have also been incorporated into two self-contained fifth grade classrooms in the school where they were initially presented.

CONCLUSION

This project demonstrates the feasibility of adapting anthropology content to learning centers in the elementary grades. While learning centers do not solve all problems of classroom instruction, learning centers may be used to enrich the program for gifted students and serve as a motivational device for under- or non-achieving students.

REFERENCES CITED

Kaplan, Sandra N., et al.
1973 Change for Children. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS AS ELEMENTARY TEACHERS: ORGANIZING A PRESENTATION

Eloise Barter / *San Juan Unified School District, Sacramento, California*

Anthropologists are sometimes asked to talk to an elementary school class. Such visits may be the result of a planned consultation or a child may simply prevail on a parent or neighbor to "come to my school." In either case, the experience may be stimulating and enjoyable to the anthropologist. The learning value to the children, however, may depend on the extent to which the anthropologist considers the psychological maturity and learning characteristics of younger learners. The following suggestions—they can hardly be called principles—are designed to help anthropologists who do not normally teach young children organize a more effective presentation for young learners. These remarks are directed to the reader in the second person as a prospective speaker to an elementary class.

SUGGESTIONS

select concepts carefully As an anthropologist, you assume you understand and know your material. But however knowledgeable about your subject, you may fail to communicate to younger audiences if you do not carefully select your objectives and choose concepts and content to make those points. No activity will point up your weakness in anthropological content and theory as much as translating a concept into language young children can understand.

You should first identify the basic concepts to be presented, and check to see that the concepts are not enmeshed in ambiguous ideas. Can you explain the concepts carefully, without resorting to technical jargon which is often mere circular explanation? Children can easily learn basic anthropological terms, but only when the underlying principles are clearly and succinctly stated with appropriate examples.

Some thought should be given even to ideas which seem common. For instance, what do you mean by Indian? Is the reference a racial group, cultural traits common to New World tribes, as a term for inhabitants of an ancient site, or a name to avoid frequent repetition of a tribal name? Older students and adults make the transitions easily from one referent to another, deriving the meaning from the context. But elementary children find such verbal operations more difficult. Thinking through and using concepts clearly and specifically will help your listeners from getting confused.

use concrete props New concepts are often learned most easily when they can be presented in association with concrete representation. Many anthropological concepts can be made graphic or associated with some manipulative activity. Don't just talk about stratigraphy—demonstrate by using a terrarium. Don't just talk about kinship—show relationships with cutouts of different colored human figures.

Use photographs liberally, but use real objects or facsimiles wherever possible. Children use all the senses in learning—young ones even taste projectile points. Use objects that children can handle, touch, and feel.

In some places, such as California, the use of Indian burial material and religious objects in classroom presentations has become controversial. The use of such material is therefore not desirable for general classroom use. However, it is still possible to generate excellent discussions around why the use of this material is controversial.

clear time-space line In talking to young children, you should keep yourself, and the class, firmly anchored in time and place. Temporal and cultural relationships are important in classroom presentation, but it is your responsibility to establish the base in time and place before beginning comparisons. Use specific names of people, and use a map to show the area inhabited and to trace any migrations or changes in locale. Talk about the past in successive chronological segments, rather than alternate between past and present.

illustrations from class experience You can use the culture of the class to introduce anthropological concepts. Children are attuned to the subtleties of their own culture, and illustrative material from the class is both cheap and easy to obtain. You can tell a child that legends persist in oral tradition, but collecting moron jokes and jump rope rhymes from elders makes the principle real. Kindergarten children know who they are forbidden to marry and with whom they will live as adults, knowledge that is easily translated into exogamy and residence patterns. Once a child recognizes a concept in his own culture, it can be enlarged and defined by examples from other times and places.

use emotion Children want to know how it feels to deal with other times and cultures. Use your own experiences and be concrete and personal. If you talk about fieldwork, tell them how you felt as well as what you did; tell them something about your personal life in the field as well as the scientific aspects. If you talk about other peoples and cultures, try to get over some idea of excitement, puzzlement, delight, and involvement in new surroundings. Nineteenth century explorers often included both their feelings and vivid descriptions of the sights, sounds, and even the smells of village life, descriptions that delight modern children. If you are restrained because of cultural biases, use your emotions and let them show. You can then use such biases as part of the class discussion. If you find your own experience difficult to share, then consult Rosalie Wax or Alberto Ruz among others. They speak on a personal level of involvement with other cultures.

take students seriously Elementary students often have information—as well as misinformation—on anthropology subject matter. While their information is often naive, the anthropologist should take their questions and point of view seriously, try to help them resolve misconceptions, and extend their knowledge. There is a difference in the technique of addressing an issue in simple language, to try to make it more meaningful to students, and talking down to students. Even abstract and complicated questions should not be turned aside, but dealt with in a direct and comprehensible manner.

SUMMARY

Anthropologists can make a contribution to elementary social studies by availing themselves of opportunities to serve as visitors, consultants, and resource teachers. Dialogue with younger learners in attempting to translate anthropology concepts to elementary students can also be rewarding to the anthropologist. The suggested procedures—selecting concepts carefully, using concrete props, clarity as to time and space orientations, drawing on the experiences of children in the class, using more emotive language, and answering children seriously—are means by which the anthropologist can make his presentation more effective with younger learners.

JOB DESCRIPTION FOR LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS POSITION

The Learning Environments Area of the Harvard Graduate School of Education is currently searching for an Assistant or Associate Professor (non-tenured) whose major educational background and training includes theoretical and methodological skills in the analysis of primary group settings (e.g., schools, families, churches, and related alternative settings).

Priority will be given to candidates who have had clinical and research experience in one of two substantive areas:

(A) Work with educationally or economically disadvantaged children or youth who face difficult transitions between home or neighborhood environments and modern mobility-oriented schools or work settings (this might include inner-city settings, rural settings, or settings in developing countries).

(B) Work within school and neighborhood settings whereby diverse helping professionals (teachers, psychologists, social workers, etc.), students, parents, and community people attempt to create support systems to deal with educational problems.

It is important that the faculty member have field experience in studying and relating to educational settings as well as a significant substantive research interest emanating from a disciplinary framework (e.g., psychology, anthropology, sociology).

The faculty places high priority on the development of appropriate models of systematic case description, combining the methods of the social scientist with the more personal style of the historian or anthropologist. The faculty is especially concerned that applicants be self-consciously sensitive to ethical and epistemological shifts in the researcher's own perception of a setting as s/he studies and acts within it.

Learning Environments is a relatively small department within the Harvard Graduate School of Education, concerned mainly with the social ecology of schools and their surrounding neighborhoods. In the future, the department will, in all likelihood, evolve to deal equally with the fields of curriculum theory, curriculum development, and the process of teaching. It currently has five faculty members who advise about 30 masters students and work intensively with about 60 doctoral students. Preferably, the new faculty member should have experience directing the field work and research of doctoral students. The department also provides appropriate courses for students from throughout the Graduate School of Education.

Harvard University is an equal opportunity employer.

REVIEW AND UPDATE: PRE-COLLEGIATE ANTHROPOLOGY MATERIALS

Thomas L. Dynneson / *University of Texas of the Permian Basin*

Anthropology materials for the teaching of pre-collegiate anthropology first became available after World War II, stimulated in part by such sponsored projects as the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project at the secondary level, the Georgia Anthropology Curriculum Project at the elementary level, and Man: A Course of Study for upper elementary. Interest in anthropology was also generated by the rise of cross-cultural studies, and emphasis on a more scientific study of other peoples.

In 1975, Dynneson summarized six major projects, five simulations and games, five texts, and some supplementary materials which drew upon or reflected the discipline of anthropology in *Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials* (published by and available from Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia). The research for this publication was carried out under a grant from ERIC/Chess with the cooperation of the Social Science Education Consortium.

This article extends the 1975 Dynneson review and includes seven new items: two courses and units, one simulation, three texts, and one film strip. Most of these items appeared under the classification "anthropology" in the ERIC/CHESS files. A questionnaire is now being sent to publishers to identify other materials which might be classified as anthropology or anthropology related. Such materials will be the subject of subsequent reviews.

COURSES AND UNITS

Anthropology: A New Approach
Margaret S. Hunt (Bantam, 1973)

Materials for this program for the eighth to twelfth grades follow a kit approach, and consist of three topical Bantam paperbacks, five area studies paperbacks from the George School Readings on Developing Lands, a cassette program, a teacher guide, student evaluation cards, and a reading log. The unifying component in the program is the teacher guide which attempts to tie the various readings together in an integrated program. It contains an overview of the unit, behavioral objectives, a unit by unit teaching plan, reading schedules, evaluation strategies, and suggested supplemental readings.

The three topical, required readings are *The Color of Man* (Robert Cohen, 1972); *People and Places* (Margaret Mead, 1970); and *Gods, Graves, and Scholars* (C. W. Ceram, 1972). The five area selections are *Africa Yesterday and Today* (Clark D. Moore and Ann Dunbar, eds., 1972); *India Yesterday and Today* (Clark D. Moore and David Eldredge, eds., 1970); *Japan Yesterday and Today* (Ray F. Downs, ed., 1971); *The Middle East Yesterday and Today* (David W. Miller and Clark D. Moore, eds., 1970); and *Latin America Yesterday and Today* (John Rothchild, ed., 1973). The 1972 cassette by Barbara and Gene Stanford presents two programs, one on "The Rites of Passage, Birth, Adolescence, Marriage, and Death," and the second on "The Riddles of Myth—Past and Present."

The procedure for the use of this course is individualized readings. The recommended procedures require the student to read assigned portions of the paperbacks and record work in a Reading Log. Questions on the evaluation cards stress broad anthropological issues and concerns.

Notwithstanding the richness of material provided, the kit approach presents a number of problems for an introductory anthropology course. The only unity is provided by the teacher guide, which is not sufficient to make an integrated introduction out of the various materials. Another problem is that large numbers of high school students would find problems with the reading level.

Humankind: Anthropology and Anthropologists
Brian J. Larkin (Macmillan, 1975)

This title is one of 18 in a series *Concepts for Social Studies*, which emphasizes conceptual teaching. In this paperback, first in the series, Larkin gives an overview of the field of anthropology, its concepts, and its methodologies. The unit contains case studies and stories that exemplify the approach that anthropologists use in solving problems. Emphasis is placed on what an anthropologist is, how anthropologists think and work, the ways that anthropologists study human behavior, and the application of anthropological knowledge to a variety of human problems.

While this unit is well written and basically accurate, some anthropologists may take exception to the way that Larkin presents the discipline in terms of organization and definitions. For instance, some definitions may be overly simplistic and many of the concepts and methodologies are too incomplete and inadequate to give a comprehensive overview of the discipline. The paperback is nevertheless satisfactory as an introduction to an elementary or junior

high anthropology program. The publishers, however, suggest secondary usage.

SIMULATIONS AND GAMES

Rafá Rafá: A Cross Cultural Simulation
Garry Shirts (Simile II, Del Mar, California, 1976)

This simulation is modeled after *Bafá Bafá* (see Dynneson 1975), with the major difference that the *Rafá* is for grades four to eight, whereas Bafá was for grades senior and adult. The strategy is identical, but *Rafá* uses more simplified cultural concepts.

This exercise is designed to help students learn how to observe, interpret, and compare cultural behavior in a simulated setting. The materials include a teacher's guide, a cassette tape, and color printed cards. The simulation is designed for 12 to 40 participants. The class is divided into two cultural groups so that two separate areas are required in order to complete the simulation. This simulation could be used in conjunction with a regular anthropology course or it could be incorporated into a variety of other social studies programs (world history or geography). Students would benefit from the skills and concepts learned in the role playing activities of this simulation.

TEXTBOOKS AND SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Exploring Civilization: A Discovery Approach
Bertha L. Linder et al. (Globe Book Company, 1974)

This junior high text approaches anthropological concepts and methods through an area studies approach. After several foundation chapters dealing with anthropological topics, there is a shift in emphasis to separate chapters on India, China, Pre-Columbian American, and Africa. These chapters are very broad in scope, and deal with geography, general culture and social organization, religion, and ethno-history.

While the text is advertised as a discovery approach, the basic strategy is deductive. The materials include a hardbound text and a softbound teacher's guide which stresses a variety of learning skills, including vocabulary development. Because this program is basically an area studies program, it does not provide systematic preparation in the discipline of anthropology. It incorporates anthropology methods and concepts as an approach to studying world cultures.

Anthropology
Zdenek Salzmann (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973)

This paperback is divided into three parts—the study of man, man and nature, and man and culture. It provides the basic information for a one semester course in high school cultural anthropology, but supplementary materials would have to be provided by the teacher. The text is not illustrated with expensive colored pictures but contains many pictures, charts, diagrams, and maps in black and white.

The chapter organization follows a conventional text format, with each chapter divided into topic sections with key terms set out in bold type. At the end of each chapter there is a chapter review section, which contains lists of key terms and review questions, mostly emphasizing definition and recall.

Inquiry into Anthropology
H. Leon Abrams (Globe Book Company, 1976)

This junior high course in introductory anthropology is organized around the subfields of anthropology—physical, cultural, technology, linguistics, and a concluding section of the nature of man's psychological and cultural behavior in the light of some current issues.

The technical quality of the text is good, with color pictures, drawings, charts, and diagrams. The readability level is appropriate for most secondary students. The content is organized into units and chapters. Each chapter begins with an aim which sets the theme, stated in question form. Basic anthropological terms are set out in italics with definitions and examples. The chapters are divided into sections with review questions and vocabulary at the end of each section.

The text title contains the word "Inquiry," a misleading usage to those seeking an inquiry text as defined pedagogically. The author defines "Inquiry" as "... an investigation, an examination. *Inquiry into Anthropology* invites you to investigate the exciting world of anthropology—the world of you and your fellow human beings" (p. ix). From a pedagogical perspective the text is basically expository.

The text is nevertheless anthropologically sound, and is suitable for a one-semester secondary course. However, if this text were adopted for a longer course, supplementary materials would be needed to bolster the content. Globe provides a filmstrip/cassette program for the same grade level that could be used in part with this program.

VISUAL MATERIAL

Anthropologists at Work (four-filmstrip/cassette program)
Peggy and Yoram Kahana (Globe Filmstrips, 1976)

The series consists of four filmstrips with narration by the anthropologist featured in the series on work in four different locations: Dr. Yoel Rak, "The Paleontologist," Israel; Dr. John Onyango, "The Archeologist," Kenya; Dr. Patricia Adler, "The Historian," Los Angeles; and Dr. Margaret Kieffer, "The Ethnologist," Guatemala. Marion J. Rice served as educational consultant.

The teacher's guide for this series contains the program rationale, a set of learning objectives, and a statement regarding the evaluation of the materials. The teacher's guide also provides the teacher with background information, a filmstrip summary, and a set of learning activities for each of the filmstrips in the series. From a technical perspective, the filmstrips are of an excellent quality, the photography is excellent, and the narration is at a level that would be ideal for secondary students. Secondary students

would be able to grasp the nature of anthropological research and problem solving as it exists in anthropology in a variety of procedures and techniques.

While this program explores scientific inquiry and discovery, from a pedagogical perspective, it is basically deductive. The learning activities reflect a traditional approach although there are some inductive activities. Learning activities in the teacher's guide emphasize learning of vocabulary words and definitions. The rationale for this program centers on the idea that audiovisual material which "... brings actual scientists to the classroom reporting about their work can help motivate (your) students to inquire into the process of scientific discovery."

While the filmstrips are generally of equal quality, "The Archaeologist" material lacks adequate presentation of field techniques. When compared to the other filmstrips it is too simplistic. The most serious objection is to the inclusion of "The Historian." It seems that the publishers are presenting historians as anthropologists. Undoubtedly, scholars from both disciplines share many common investigative attributes. However, to present historians as anthropologists defeats the purpose of this program, which is designed specifically to present the methodological specializations within anthropology to pre-collegiate students.

In general, however, the quality of the photography, the content sequencing, and the level of narration make this series suitable for secondary students.

REFERENCES CITED

Dynneson, Thomas L.
1975 Pre-Collegiate Anthropology: Trends and Materials. University of Georgia, Athens: Anthropology Curriculum Project.

COUNCIL ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION

FUTURE HORIZONS IN ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION: THE VIEW FROM 1976

The unwritten constitution of the CAE very wisely provides that old presidents should fade away, so as to allow our excellent system of circulating leadership to be fully effective. So this is my last hurrah, and in sounding it I would like to ask you to think with me about our future horizons, about those areas of substantive concern that our organization and field might wisely attempt to grow into between now and, say, the year 2000. In my *tour d'horizon*, I shall limit my comments to just seven areas of concern. In specifying these seven, I do not wish to imply that no CAE members are already working in these areas, nor do I wish to imply that CAE members working in other, more "mainstream" areas ought not to continue working where they are happy and productive. Rather, I am suggesting that an emphasis on these relatively new areas will help bring new members into our organization and new freshness and relevance to a field already characterized by high creativity and promise.

1. CULTURAL FUTURISTICS

The first suggested future emphasis I would offer is simply that we, as a subprofession, become more systematically concerned with the future itself: with the future of whole cultures, with cultural futuristics. As anthropologists, I feel that we have a good deal to give to this field, both because we tend to view phenomena holistically and because we are skilled in *empathic* ethnography. As I browse through the futuristic literature, I am struck by a certain elite bias, and an inferrable vicarious power drive on the part of some futurists which causes them to concentrate on the political variables at the expense of the cultural, and on the feelings and preferences of elites at the expense of those of ordinary people. As educators, too, I think we can contribute to futuristics, if only because education is, among professional fields, par excellence and indeed *uniquely* future-oriented. I also feel, however, that as anthropologists we have much to gain *from* other futurists, especially because our ethnographic biases sometimes produce a certain localism and too often prevent us from seeing broader interdependency in an increasingly interdependent world. As educators, too, I feel that the futurists have something to offer us. Too often, certain types of professional educators orient to the future in too-narrow terms; this is particularly true of educational administrators.

It might be objected by some that cultural futuristics is by definition an almost self-defeating field—for how can one study that which has not yet occurred? Given that the epistemology of futuristics is different from that of ethnology and ethnography, my answer is yet that we are stuck with the future and that, in an era of ever-accelerating sociocultural change, a holistic discipline like ours is vitally needed in the study of probable and alternative futures. The future is simply too important to be left solely to those professional futurologists who for whatever reasons, benign or otherwise, find themselves working primarily for highly privileged governmental or corporation clients whose (understandable) concern is to seek ways and means of preserving their positions of privilege far into the future. Attempts to shape and indeed to *invent* the future require a considerable measure of pluralism among futurists and among their sponsors, and the kind of disinterestedness which CAE members can often provide (see Waskow 1969:83ff).

Quite aside from questions of bias, I would add that anthropologists need not feel overawed on grounds of general competence or wisdom, either. I discover on reading one of the most deservedly famous of the futurists, who published a book in 1972 which projected to 1985, that he totally missed the oil shortage of 1973 and in general blithely assumed, worldwide, that energy would be no major problem (Kahn and Bruce-Briggs 1972). With this sort of expertise looming large in the field, I find it hardly brazen to suggest that there is room for us "soft" social scientists in futuristics!

Further, in my judgment, those anthropologists who are already "into" cultural futuristics are acquitting themselves well. Both the 1970 and 1971 meetings of the AAA had ambitious futuristics sessions, the papers of which have been published (Cultural Futurology Symposium 1970, 1971). A number of fine thinkpieces were contributed by such anthropologists as Maruyama, Gerlach, and Polgar, to name but a few. However, I have not as yet found much involvement in this field by CAE members, despite the obvious need to understand how to plan educational programs designed to help the young—and all of us—get ready to cope with, and in some measure to shape, the probabilities and ambiguities of the future.

I would close my comments on cultural futuristics with the perhaps hopelessly staid remark that, aside from a very considerable heuristic value, I do not see great pay-off in futuristic speculation about extra-terrestrial settlements. My concern is rather with the great bulk of the world's four

billion people—and there probably will be at least ten billion before demographic stabilization is reached—whose future is earth-bound.

2. GLOBAL EMPHASIS

A holistic concern with cultural futuristics almost automatically implies a world-wide perspective, a set of global concerns that embraces not only the comparative and hologeistic cross-cultural approaches, but also the striking and accelerating growth in technological, economic, and political *interdependency* among the sociocultural systems of the earth.

In the CAE we have been highly U.S.-centered in our research undertakings, and half of our literature is U.S.-specific (Textor 1975b). All this is historically understandable, given that we were born in the racially-torn 1960s when the Vietnam Crime was causing the Great Society to abort, and given the simple fact that there was, and remains, great need for educational research and reform in the United States. Nonetheless, as a subdisciplinary field, we need to diversify, since the essential advantage of cultural anthropology is that its theories and caveats are based on cultural samples taken from all over the world. The U.S. and Canada are *not* a sufficient crucible of variability to serve our theory-building needs; they do not, to name but one example out of many, adequately include the phenomenon of peasantry.

Strong emphasis within the CAE upon studying educational structure and process among the other 94% of the world's population would not only help attract new American and Canadian members to the CAE, but would also encourage new members from the Third and Second Worlds. Especially since no other nation, to my knowledge, has an organization specifically bringing together Anthropology with Education, how would we feel about attempts to make the CAE a more nearly world-wide organization? Since many scholars in the Third World, and some in the Second, have vastly less disposable income than our current members, it might be well to consider instituting a new, less expensive category of membership, such as "corresponding member," and offer such status to scholars in other lands who would like to participate through the *Quarterly*, but who cannot afford to attend our annual conclaves. What I am suggesting here is no dramatic break with the present—after all, we do have a fair number of overseas members right now—but rather, a deliberate, affirmative program designed positively to attract non-American, non-Canadian members on whatever basis makes most sense. Input into our *Quarterly* of articles and letters from the Third and Second Worlds could have a healthy deprovincializing effect upon all of us.

3. MACRO APPROACHES

Cultural anthropology in its ethnographic mode is virtually unique among the social sciences in its emphasis upon holistic observation and analysis of relatively micro situations—and may this always be true. Anthropology and Education as practiced in the United States has also been characterized by a very considerable localistic emphasis, which reflects in part the fact that this country itself is characterized by relatively extreme local control of education—with some 17,000 local school districts—while most other countries have centralized systems of control. I believe there is a need, both in Anthropology and Education and in cultural anthropology generally, for increased emphasis upon macro analysis, and upon the *articulation* between national or regional levels, and local levels. I think our new Standing Committee on Transnational Issues in Education and Change will be making an important contribution in this respect.

4. QUANTITATIVE METHODOLOGY

Traditionally ethnography has been defined as a largely qualitative approach to the description and analysis of human phenomena. Personally, I regard this strong qualitative emphasis as utterly essential to my functioning as an anthropologist-educator. However, as Pelto and others of our *Geschwister* resoundingly remind us, we sometimes emphasize qualitative analysis to the point of perpetrating a mystique upon our readers (Pelto 1970:30-45). There is currently a strong trend toward combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in such a fashion that each enriches the other, and I think we should move with this trend.

Unless more of us (and I include myself) become more familiar with, for example, multivariate and path analysis, I see important drawbacks looming. First, I think we will deny ourselves the chance to collaborate fruitfully with our more quantitative colleagues in psychology, sociology, and economics. Second, I think we will lose what I consider to be our rightful influence over policy-makers, who often prefer numerical measurement, especially of educational outcomes in evaluation studies. True, we are often at our best in questioning the very validity or cultural relevance of the quantitative indices used in such studies—but we will be more effective critics if we show a thorough understanding of the quantitative methodology involved, and *then* go on to criticize cultural relevance.

It must be emphasized, however, that just as ethnographers are reaching out to quantitative research techniques, our colleagues on the quantitative side are increasingly reaching toward ethnographic description as a means of qualifying, interpreting, and understanding the (often inconsistent) results of quantitative analysis in educational research. No less creative a leader in the latter form of analysis than Lee Cronbach has recently called for "intensive local observation [that] goes beyond discipline to an open-eyed, open-minded appreciation of the surprises nature deposits in the investigative net. . . . I suspect that if the psychologist were to read more widely in history, ethnology, and the centuries of humanistic writings on man

and society, he would be better prepared for this part of his work" (Cronbach 1975:125).

Thus the times are propitious, I believe, for intensive dialogue between "metric" and "ethnographic" researchers in the field of education, and during the past year I was pleased to serve as the CAE's representative in working out cooperative arrangements with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development for a workshop designed to stimulate just such a dialogue. The workshop was held in Monterey, California last July. Papers were given by a variety of "metricists," as well as CAE members Courtney Cazden, Frederick Erickson, Eleanor Leacock, Ray Rist, and Louis Smith. Also participating were John Chilcott, John Herzog, Dell Hymes, and myself. Every CAE member will receive a personal copy of the carefully edited proceedings, in the form of the May 1977 *Quarterly*. No conference of this sort is ever a perfect success, but it is my view that some useful results were produced which will have springboarding significance for the future.

5. POLITICAL ECONOMY, DEPENDENCY, AND EXPLOITATION

I think the CAE would be a more vital organization if we confronted more directly the limits placed upon the potential of the educative process by political economy, dependency, and exploitation. There is, I think, lurking within the central motivation of most educators a kind of residual faith that if only the right educational approach can be found, people will somehow change and problems will be solved. The accumulating literature in the field of international development education, however, reveals how stoutly obdurate is the fact that the education system *mirrors* the political economy and thus often tends to perpetuate privilege and dependency, hence exploitation.

A recent rate-of-return study by Blair, for example, shows conclusively that Chicano males in Santa Clara County, California, would actually be better off, in terms of lifetime earnings, if they dropped out of high school in their sophomore year and went straight to work—*if* one assumes that ascriptive barring of them from well-paying jobs will be a feature of the job market throughout their working careers (Blair 1972). Examples of this sort are multiplying rapidly in the literature.

With these kinds of social rigidities constantly constraining the potential for education to produce "development" (by which I mean a tendency toward a situation permitting optimum value fulfillment) we face an absolute need to view education in broad sociocultural context—and in political and economic context as well. Since anthropology is by definition context-oriented, this ought to come naturally, and no doubt the new Standing Committee on Transnational Issues in Education and Change will provide some of the leadership needed.

6. LIFE-LONG AND NONFORMAL EDUCATION

If there is one thing that cultural futuristics teaches us, it is that the exponentially increasing pace of sociocultural change will necessitate life-long re-education and self-education as a means of adaptation—of minimizing "future shock," if you will. Indeed, there is growing consensus among futurists that the U.S. and certain other high-income nations have already moved into a "post-industrial" age variously termed the "knowledge" age or the "communications" era (Bell 1973; Theobald 1968, 1976). In this new era it will be increasingly true that "what one knows" will be more important than "what one produces" in a physical sense. The explosion of knowledge and the increase in communication density have been staggering. The distinction between working and learning has become blurred. Life-long intentional cognitive growth has become essential to all those who would wrest from life its full potential, in a sense that was not true two decades ago, or perhaps even one. A post-industrial society is, hence, an education-seeking and an education-providing society.

In the First World and parts of the Second World, the approach to post-industrial society through education clearly implies, among other things, strong emphasis upon less-than-formal education. And in the Third World, much of the effort to produce "development" through education must necessarily involve nonformal and informal education of adult populations already committed as to occupational and other roles; LaBelle's recent typology of the different degrees of formality of education, published in the *Quarterly*, is a useful point of departure here (LaBelle 1975). There is much that the CAE can do, too, in encouraging anthropological research upon the various efforts now under way to hasten modernization through television- and satellite-mediated techniques, techniques whose actual social pay-off is likely to be considerably lower than their enthusiasts envision.

7. EDUCATION CONCERNING ECOLOGY AND ENERGY

As I read more deeply into the energy literature, I find myself wryly concluding that however enthusiastic one is about the cultural materialist approach to sociocultural change and evolution (and I count myself an enthusiast), it is almost inevitable that, like it or not, the world will see various implications of this theoretical stance rigorously tested within the next 25 years. Unless some miraculous technological breakthrough suddenly, safely, economically, and reliably provides a substitute for fossil fuels, sociocultural systems around the world, including our own, are going to be placed under crushing pressure to change, and in some very painful ways. I suspect that my own case is not atypical: I find myself simply avoiding the issue, blotting it out of my consciousness as too unpleasant to contemplate. I simply have not been enculturated to face a relatively sudden diminution of the luxuries that are available to me because of high-energy technology. At the very least, what I need is conscientization as to just how much of the world's energy I, and others like me, consume.

One way to get a hold on the problem is simply to look at how much energy it cost to bring an estimated 6,000

people to Washington to attend the 1976 AAA *corroboree*. I have made careful estimates and calculations, and checked these with an energy engineer, who judged that the results are reasonable (Connolly 1976; see note 1). Briefly, my conclusion is that the energy used in transporting all of us to Washington by air, from an estimated average distance of 800 miles, was about the same as that consumed for the entire year of 1965 (the last year for which statistics are available) by 20,000 Guatemalans for *all* purposes: cooking, transportation, electric lighting, manufacturing, infrastructural modernization—everything. For every 500 travel-miles, count one Guatemalan energy-year. My round trip from California was 6,000 miles, or the equivalent of 12 Guatemalans' annual "energy-rights," if you will. I am no expert on the wearing of hair shirts, and on those few occasions when I have tried it, the shirt didn't fit. Nonetheless, if I am to consider myself a conscientized member of the human species, then surely the question must occasionally occur to me as to what social contribution I am making that would justify this sort of inequity in energy use. Which, I wonder, is more true: that I am in some small measure helping to solve the problem of energy and inequity, or that I am, however unwittingly, part of that problem?

I am struck, too, by how deep are the historical and cultural roots of American high-energy consumption. Recently, for example, I was stunned when told, on reliable technical authority, that the per capita energy consumption of France *today* is no higher than it was in the United States in 1850! (Connolly 1976). While it is true that some of that 1850 American energy consumption resulted simply from the burning of slash left over from clearing the woodlands for farming, nonetheless what this datum strongly suggests is that since at least the time when my great-grandparents were establishing farms, homes, and businesses in Wisconsin 125 years ago, there have been cultural forces at work that have shaped certain energy attitudes in me which are, today, quite inappropriate. Whether I and millions like me can change enough, in time, poses a huge question in sociocultural analysis and, ultimately, in educational analysis.

The need, then, seems clear for Americans to conserve energy. We must seek actively for ways in which this can be done while still maintaining growth and flexibility sufficient to work out our nasty problems of inter-ethnic and inter-class inequity. More poignant still are the problems faced by such Third World nations as Bangladesh which struggle merely to survive—against the backdrop of rising costs of energy, and petroleum for the manufacture of fertilizer. Energy shortages can bring down the most intrepid and constructive of efforts at change. Our best minds are needed to address this problem. Some of these minds should be anthropological minds, and among those, some should be from Anthropology and Education. The new Standing Committee on Ecological Issues in Anthropology and Education can bring special expertise to this area of concern (see Textor 1975a).

In seeking solutions, it is best for the anthropologist to look first at what creative people are doing already. For example, I recently discovered an extremely creative organization just a few blocks from my home in Palo Alto, namely the Media Project of the Simple Living Program of the American Friends Service Committee. The Simple Living Program emphasizes theorization, discussion, and voluntary action aimed at new life-styles involving less use of fossil fuels and scarce mineral resources, less consumerism, and less "plastic" living in general. These committed people are deliberately turning away from much that is phoney in American life, and searching, together, for a better way. They have their own newspaper, which contains both theoretical articles and practical hints on everything from bartering used goods to growing home gardens. People like this, who insist on treating the energy crisis as a cultural *challenge*, offer great hope for the future. And it is noteworthy that although there is not a professional anthropologist among them, their theoretical articles make free and creative use of the anthropological literature in conceptualizing, and constructing scenarios for, simple living. In just one issue of their journal, *Simple Living*, they referred to work by all of the anthropologists whose names are asterisked in the References below.[3] Another group associated with the Simple Living Program has produced a challenging packet entitled *Taking Charge* [of one's own life in an ecologically sensible fashion], which will soon be published in book form nationally.[2] In their own way, people such as these might well be applying anthropology more effectively than some of us professionals ever have. Nor are they alone in their endeavors; small groups of similarly oriented people are springing up all over the country.[3]

* * *

Let me summarize my comments on the future horizons of Anthropology and Education. I urge that we try to become as expert in looking at the future as we already are in looking at the past; that we do so with global scope through macro lenses without flinching from quantitative measurement where appropriate; that political economy and exploitation be always part of our contextual perspective; that less formal kinds of education engage more of our concern; and that we attempt to convert the energy crisis into a constructive cultural challenge.

Let me conclude by thanking all of you for having made the last three years very rewarding and memorable ones in my life. I value highly the many new friends I have made through the CAE. I thank Elizabeth Eddy and John Herzog for the genuine commitment and leadership they have shown—and Jack Chilcott and Glenn Hendricks as well. Under Fred Erickson and Dell Hymes, our continued maturation on into the future is well assured. We're going to be around a long time, and making a difference—and that is satisfaction enough.

Robert B. Textor

NOTES

[1] In consultation with an official of the AAA who gave me unofficial estimates, I assume that 6,000 individuals attended the 1976 AAA Annual Meeting in Washington (including registered participants, free-loaders, and spouses) and that the average attender came from a distance of 800 miles. This yields 6,000 round trips of 1600 miles each. This adds up to 9,600,000 conventioneer-miles. For simplicity let us assume that these are all air-miles, and let us round the figure to 10,000,000 air miles to allow for energy consumed in ground transportation to and from airports, taxis for cruising to Washington restaurants, and other energy costs.

How much of the world's fossil-fuel energy is consumed by ten million conventioneer-miles of air travel? Each passenger-mile is estimated to burn up 11,200 British Thermal Units of energy—that is, enough energy to raise the temperature of 11,200 pounds (1400 gallons) of water by one degree Fahrenheit (Hirst 1974:10). Most of this energy cost is expressed directly in terms of jet fuel, but the indirect energy cost of extracting and refining that jet fuel must also be included. Thus 6,000 conventioneers consumed an estimated 112 billion British Thermal Units of energy in making the Washington trip. This is the energy-equivalent of 4,150 tons of coal (Darmstadter et al. 1971:59).

In 1965 the average Guatemalan consumed, for all purposes for a whole year, the energy-equivalent of just about 415 pounds of coal (Darmstadter et al. 1971:67). Dividing 4,150 tons (8,300,000 pounds) by 415 pounds yields 20,000. Thus, I crudely estimate that attendance at the five-day AAA meetings cost the energy-equivalent of 20,000 Guatemalans' annual energy consumption in 1965.

[2] The Simple Living Program, American Friends Service Committee, 514 Bryant St., Palo Alto, CA 94302, publishes the newspaper *Simple Living* about every two months. There is no fixed subscription fee, but a donation of three dollars per year is suggested. The commercial version of *Taking Charge* will be published in paperback by Bantam Books in early 1977.

[3] A clearinghouse of information on grass-roots activities and organizations oriented toward simple living, meaningful ecological action, and local responsibility is the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, 1717 18th St., N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

REFERENCES CITED

Bell, Daniel
1973 The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. New York: Basic Books.

Blair, Philip M.
1972 Job Discrimination and Education, An Investment Analysis: A Case Study of Mexican-Americans in Santa Clara County, California. New York: Praeger.

Connolly, Thomas
1976 Personal Communication.

Cronbach, Lee J.
1975 Beyond the Two Disciplines of Scientific Psychology. American Psychologist 30(2). (Requests for reprints should be sent to Lee J. Cronbach, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.)

Cultural Futurology Symposium (of the American Anthropological Association)
1970 Pre-Conference Volume. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Office of Applied Social Science and the Future.
1971 Pre-Conference Volume. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Office of Applied Social Science and the Future.

Darmstadter, Joel
1971 Energy in the World Economy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

*Diamond, Stanley
1974 In Search of the Primitive. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Hirst, Eric
1974 Total Energy Use for Commercial Aviation in the U.S. Oak Ridge: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Kahn, Herman, and B. Bruce-Briggs
1972 Things to Come: Thinking about the Seventies and Eighties. New York: Macmillan.

*Lee, Dorothy
1961 Freedom and Culture. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

*Lee, Richard, and Irven Devore
1968 Man the Hunter. Chicago: Aldine.

LaBelle, Thomas J.
1975 Liberation, Development, and Rural Non-Formal Education. CAE Quarterly VI(4):20-26.

*Mauss, Marcel
1954 The Gift. Glencoe: Free Press.

Pelto, Pertti J.
1970 Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

*Sahlins, Marshall
1972 Stone Age Economics. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Textor, Robert B.
1975a President's Report (on the ecological crisis and education). CAE Quarterly VI(2):34-35.
1975b President's Report (on the need to internationalize Anthropology and Education). CAE Quarterly VI(3):23-25.

Theobald, Robert
1968 An Alternative Future for America II. Chicago: Swallow Press.
1976 Beyond Despair: Directions for America's Third Century. Washington: New Republic Book Co.

Waskow, Arthur I.
1969 Looking Forward: 1999. *In* Mankind 2000. Robert Jungk and Johan Galtung, eds. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

In this issue of the *Quarterly* as we welcome to the editor's chair Charles Harrington, of Teachers College, Columbia University, we also say hail and farewell to John Chilcott, the previous editor. We are delighted at Harrington's accession and are most grateful to Chilcott for his years of effective labor for us.

Thanks also go to John Herzog, who now is past president of CAE. One of his last official duties as president was to chair the committee that selected the new *Quarterly* editor from a field of five applicants. The number and quality of applicants was gratifying, and made the committee's decision a difficult one; all the more significant for the life of CAE. We thank all those who applied for doing so and for providing the extensive information requested by the Search Committee, whose members included in addition to Herzog, Frances Schwartz, Paul Carlson, Bud Khlief, and Richard Warren.

Other news of publication activity: CAE participated in sponsoring, together with the National Institute of Education and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, a conference in Monterey last July titled "Exploring Quantitative/Qualitative Research Methodologies in Education." Our participation was arranged by Robert Textor and John Herzog. CAE members who presented papers at the meeting included Ray Rist, Roger Shuy, Courtney Cazden, Dell Hymes, Louis M. Smith, and

Frederick Erickson. The conference papers will appear as the May issue of the *Quarterly*. In addition, the bibliography on anthropology and education prepared with CAE sponsorship in 1975 by Jacquetta Hill has been sold out, and a second printing has been issued by the publisher, HRAF Press. Discussions continue about possibilities for computerized storage and updating of a bibliography of anthropology and education.

This year's annual meeting was held in conjunction with that of the American Anthropological Association in Washington, D.C. November 17-21. During that time Dell Hymes took office as president-elect of CAE and program coordinator for the 1977 annual meeting in Houston, Texas. The deadline for proposals for formal symposia and informal discussion sessions for the 1977 meetings is May 1, 1977. Please consult the November 1976 issue of the *Anthropology Newsletter* for information about the proposal submission process and also contact Dell Hymes for further information well in advance of the May 1 deadline. His title and address is: Dean, School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19174, and his telephone number is (215) 243-7014.

The program for the 1976 meetings was large and sessions were well attended. Six formal symposia and seven informal discussion sessions took place, as well as business meetings of the standing committees. There were a few scheduling conflicts, but these were remarkably few, considering the numbers of sessions and persons involved. I want to thank the organizers of sessions for their initiative, and the office of the Executive Director of the AAA, especially Edward Lehman and Christina Malec, for their cooperation and helpful advice. I am also grateful to Solon Kimball and George Spindler for their most gracious and informative conversation at our CAE "plenary session" on the evolution of the field of anthropology and education.

At our general meeting on November 20 Robert Textor gave the Past President's address (included in this issue on p. 00) and received the thanks of the meeting for his service to CAE. Ward Goodenough addressed us, announcing the formation of an Institute for Anthropological Research Services, which would help develop policy research projects in which currently unemployed anthropologists could find jobs, and provide advice to individuals and university departments about applied research funding opportunities.

All members of the AAA, including employed members of CAE are being asked to contribute (tax deductible) seed money for the development of the Institute for Research Services. At our meeting there were 19 contributions to this fund, totaling $938, the largest amount given during the annual meeting by any cooperating organization. Members of CAE who wish to contribute can send contributions for and/or receive information about the Institute by contacting the office of the Executive Director of AAA, 1703 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

Peggy Sanday reported on a related issue; the development of a contract research proposal to the National Institute of Education for a short-term ethnographic study of the implementation of compensatory education programs ("Title 1 funded") in a few rural communities of the United States. CAE members have been asked to develop the proposal, and the CAE Board of Directors was asked to propose a slate of steering committee members to oversee the project; a slate subject to subsequent approval by the Executive Board of AAA. If funded, this project would be the first in which AAA was involved in a contract research relationship with a federal agency, so our actions in the next months are precedent-setting. Steven Arvizu reminded us of this during the meeting, and of the importance of involving representatives of the communities studied in the planning and conduct of such applied research.

At the CAE Board of Directors meeting Sunday, November 21, we proposed a slate of steering committee members for the NIE project. As of this writing our proposed slate has not been acted upon yet by the AAA Executive Board, nor has the project proposal yet been submitted or approved, so I will wait until later in the year to report further on this matter.

The CAE Board changed from *ad hoc* to standing committee status the committee on *Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation in Education*. Kathleen Adams of the *ad hoc* committee on population issues announced a change in title of the group to Environmental Issues in Anthropology.

Finally and regretfully, the Board found it necessary to increase annual dues from $7.50 to $10. Although we are currently in sound fiscal shape, unavoidable increases in the costs of publishing the *Quarterly* have made the dues change necessary. The institutional rate remains the same, and if your library does not presently subscribe to the *Quarterly* please urge that this be done. It will both increase the audience of the *Quarterly* and provide some of the necessary financial cushioning to support its continued production.

So in its own small way, CAE has struck a blow for income redistribution in the United States. And I made no promises not to raise taxes.

Frederick Erickson

BOOKS FROM TEACHERS COLLEGE PRESS

ANTHROPOLOGY & EDUCATION SERIES
Solon T. Kimball, Editor

CULTURE AND THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS
An Anthropological Perspective
Solon T. Kimball
1974/285 pp./Cl. $10.00/Pa. $4.95

LIFE CYCLES IN ATCHALÁN
The Diverse Careers of Certain Guatemalans
Alexander Moore
1973/220 pp./Cl. $9.50

THE RITES OF PASSAGE IN A STUDENT CULTURE
A Study of the Dynamics of Transition
Thomas A. Leemon
1972/215 pp./Cl. $8.95/Pa. $4.95

FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM
Courtney B. Cazden, Vera John, Dell Hymes, Editors
1972/LX+394 pp./Cl. $12.95/Pa. $6.95

LEARNING TO BE ROTUMAN
Enculturation in the South Pacific
Alan Howard
1970/184 pp./Cl. $7.95

THE CULTURE OF CHILDHOOD
Child's-Eye Views of Society and Culture
Mary Ellen Goodman
1970/167 pp./Pa. $4.50

BECOMING A TEACHER
The Passage to Professional Status
Elizabeth M. Eddy
1969/167 pp./Pa. $4.50

PERSPECTIVES FROM ANTHROPOLOGY
Rachel Reese Sady
1969/98 pp./Pa. $3.25

THE WAY TO MODERN MAN
An Introduction to Human Evolution
Fred T. Adams
1968/284 pp./Cl. $9.95/Pa. $4.95

CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN LATIN AMERICA SERIES
Lambros Comitas, Editor

THE HAITIAN POTENTIAL
Research and Resources of Haiti
Vera Rubin and Richard P. Schaedel, Editors
1975/304 pp./Cl. $15.00

THE DOMINICAN DIASPORA
From the Dominican Republic to New York City—Villagers in Transition
Glenn Hendricks
1974/171 pp./Cl. $9.95/Pa. $5.95

STATUS AND POWER IN RURAL JAMAICA
A Study of Educational and Political Change
Nancy Foner
Foreword by Raymond T. Smith
1973/172 pp./Cl. $8.50/Pa. $4.50

POLITICS AND THE POWER STRUCTURE
A Rural Community in the Dominican Republic
Malcolm T. Walker
1972/177 pp./Cl. $9.00

TELLING TONGUES
Language Policy in Mexico, Colony to Nation
Shirley Brice Heath
1972/320 pp./Cl. $10.00/Pa. $5.95

ALSO OF INTEREST . . .

ERRORS IN SEX-ROLE BEHAVIOR IN TEEN-AGE BOYS
Charles C. Harrington
1970/109 pp./Cl. $6.50/Pa. $2.95

TO WASH AN AETHIOP WHITE
British Ideas About Black African Educability 1530-1960
Charles H. Lyons
1975/192 pp./Cl. $7.50

AFRICAN REACTIONS TO MISSIONARY EDUCATION
Edward Berman, Editor
1975/256 pp./Pa. $7.50

CULTURAL ADAPTATION WITHIN MODERN AFRICA
S.H. Irvine and J.T. Sanders, Editors
1972/162 pp./Cl. $7.50

Send for descriptive catalog

TEACHERS COLLEGE PRESS
1234 Amsterdam Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10027

COUNCIL ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION
Board of Directors 1976-77

President: *Frederick D. Erickson*, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Longfellow Hall, 13 Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138

1st Vice President (Immediate Past President): *John D. Herzog*, Northeastern University, College of Education, Boston, MA 02115

2nd Vice President (President Elect): *Dell Hymes*, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19174

Secretary-Treasuer: *Glenn L. Hendricks*, Student Life Studies and Planning, 328 Walter Library, University of Minnesota, 117 Pleasant Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455

Editor, Anthropology and Education Quarterly: *Charles Harrington*, Box 19, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

Members at Large: *Peggy Sanday* (1977), Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 33rd and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19174; *Courtney Cazden* (1978), Graduate School of Education, Larsen Hall, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; *St. Clair Drake* (1979), Department of Anthropology, Stanford University, Sanford, CA 94305

Standing Committee Chairpersons

Committee 1: Anthropological Studies of School and Culture–
Kenneth Baer, The Lullwater School 2399 Williams Lane, Decatur, GA 30033
Richard Zimmer, Hutchin School at Sonoma State, Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Committee 2: Cognitive and Linguistic Studies–
John Ogbu, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94820
Evelyn Jacob, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19174

Committee 3: Materials and Methods for Teaching Anthropology–
Marion J. Rice, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602
Thomas Dynneson, University of Texas, Permian Basin Parkway, E. University, Odessa, TX 79762

Committee 4: Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation in Education–
Woody Clark, Institute for Race and Community Relations, 30 Northgate Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
Jean J. Schensul, Kings Point, Monaco N668, Del Ray Beach, FL 33446

Committee 5: Transnational Issues in Education and Change–
Johannes Wilbert, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024

Committee 7: Blacks in Education–
Sheila Walker, Division of Higher Education, 4607 Tolman Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

Committee 8: Spanish-Speaking Concerns in Education–
Lucila Carrasco-Schoch, Sociology Department, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92037

Committee 9: Women in Schools and Society–
Judith Preissle Goetz, Social Science Education, Dudley Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602

Committee 10: Environmental Issues in Anthropology–
Kathleen Adams, Department of Anthropology, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, WA 98926

Ad Hoc Committee Chairperson

Ad Hoc Committee 1: Employment
Willis Sibley, Department of Anthropology, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115

COUNCIL ON ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION MEMBERSHIP/SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____
city state zip code

Indicate Committees of Special Interest:

___ Individual Membership $7.50 (___ AAA Member)
includes $4.00 for a subscription to the *Quarterly*

___ Library Subscription $10.00

Mail with check to Council on Anthropology and Education, 1703 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20009

ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION QUARTERLY
Council on Anthropology and Education
1703 New Hampshire Avenue NW
Washington DC 20009

2nd Class
Postage Paid
Washington DC